THE

BRITISH CRITIC,

AND

QUARTERLY

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

VOLUME XXIII.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL;
AND
SOLD BY BELL AND BRADFUTE, EDINBURGH; AND
MILLIKEN, DUBLIN.

1838.

Rare
AP
4
.B73
1838
pt.1

LONDON:
C. ROWORTH AND SONS, BELL YARD,
TEMPLE BAR.

72 2734

INDEX OF BOOKS REVIEWED,

OR

NOTICED IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

⁂ *For Remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, and Ecclesiastical Record, see the Index at the end of the Volume.*

A.

A Bill to abridge the holding of Benefices in Plurality, 455.

A Letter on the Augmentation of a particular Class of Poor Livings. By the Earl of Harrowby, 455.

Anderson (Rev. James S. M.), Sermons on Various Subjects, 103.

Are Cathedral Institutions useless? A practical Answer to this Question, 455.

A Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution, 1688. By Thomas Vowler Short, B.D., 48.

B.

Baxter (Richard), Life and Times of. By the Rev. William Orme, 48.

Benson (Rev. C.), On the Proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 455.

Book of the Fathers, containing Lives of celebrated Fathers of the Christian Church, and the Spirit of their Writings, 24.

C.

Chapter and Collegiate Memorials, 455.

Chandler (Rev. George), D.C.L., Sermon on the Daily Service of the Church, 455.

Charges of the Right Rev. the Bishops of Durham, Winchester, and Lincoln, in the year 1837..174.

Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham, 455.

Colquhoun (J. C.), The System of National Education in Ireland, 566.

Commissioners appointed to consider the State of the Established Church in England and Wales. Their Fifth Report, 455.

Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. By the Rev. Michael Russell, D.D., 396.

"*Continuing daily with one accord in the Temple.*" A Sermon, 455.

Cousin (M.), Report on the State of Education in Holland. Translated by Mr. Horner, 439.

Craufurd (Rev. C. H.), The Law of the Mind and the Law of the Members. A Sermon, 376.

D.

Durham (The Right Rev. the Bishop of), Charge to his Clergy in 1837..174.

E.

Ecclesiastical Commission, and the Universities, 455.

——————— correspondence between, and the Bishop of Ely, 455.

——————— on the proceedings of, *ib.*

——————— on the illegal character of, *ib.*

Erskine (Thomas), Esq., The Doctrine of Election, illustrated from the Epistle to the Romans, 299.

F.

Faber (Rev. G. S.), The Primitive Doctrine of Election, 299.

Froude (Rev. Richard Hurrell), Remains, 200.

Fysh (Frederic), "The Beast and his Image," 563.

G.

Glover (Rev. F. A.), Reduction of Prebendaries, 455.

H.

Harrowby (Earl of), Letter on the Augmentation of a particular Class of Poor Livings, &c., 455.

Histoire des Juifs dans le Moyen Age, 396.

K.

Knox (Alexander, Esq.), Remains, 1.

L.

Lincoln (The Right Rev. the Bishop of), Charge to his Clergy in 1837..174.

M.

Manning (H. E.), The Principle of the Ecclesiastical Commission examined, 455.

Metropolis Churches Fund, First Report of, up to June 23, 1837..179.

O.

Oakeley (Rev. F.), Remarks upon the Aristotelian and Platonic Ethics, as a branch of the Studies pursued in the University of Oxford, 376.

Observations on the Illegal and Unconstitutional Character of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 455.

O'Connor (Henry), Connected Essays and Tracts, 567.

Orme (Rev. William), The Life and Times of Richard Baxter, 48.

P.

Palin (Rev. William), Village Lectures on the Litany, 567.

Pashley's Travels in Crete, 225.

Pusey (Rev. Dr.), Patience and Confidence the Strength of the Church. A Sermon preached on the Fifth of November, before the University of Oxford, 140.

Q.

Quin (Edward), An Universal History, 565.

R.

Reid (Rev. James Seaton), D.D., The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 149.

Report of the Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday Schools, 329.

——— of the British and Foreign School Society, *ib.*

S.

Sewell (Rev. W.), the Dangers and Safeguards of Ethical Science. (Inaugural Lecture), 376.

Short (Rev. T. V.), A Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution, 1688..48.

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Two Memorials addressed to the General Meeting of, 113.

Society for Promoting the Employment of additional Curates in Populous Places. Preliminary Paper, 179.

Spry (Rev. J. H.), D.D., Some Observations on the tendency of a Measure for the future Regulation of Cathedral and Collegiate Bodies, 455.

Stuart (Moses), A Grammar of the New Testament Dialect, 565.

T.

The Ecclesiastical Commission and the Universities, 455.

The Prebendary, or Cathedral Establishment, 455.

The Primitive Doctrine of Election. By G. S. Faber, B.D., 299.

The Vicar of Wrexhill. By Mrs. Trollope, 85.

Thorp (Rev. C.), D.D., Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham, 455.

Travels in Crete. By R. Pashley, Esq., 225.

Treffry (Richard), An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ, 566.

Two Memorials, addressed to the General Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, on the alleged corrupt character of some of its Publications, 113.

W.

Whewell (Rev. William), On the Foundation of Morals. Four Sermons, 376.

Whitefield (Rev. George), Life and Times. By Robert Philip, 265.

Winchester (The Right Rev. the Bishop of), Charge to his Clergy in 1837..174.

Woodgate (Rev. H. A.), The Study of Morals vindicated and recommended. A Sermon, 376.

Wordsworth (Rev. Christopher), D.D., The Ecclesiastical Commission and the Universities, 455.

CONTENTS

OF

N°. XLVII.

PAGE.

ART. I. 1. Schleiermacher's Introduction to the Dialogues of Plato. Translated from the German by William Dobson.

2. Initia Philosophiæ Platonicæ. Auct. Phil. Gul. Van Heusde 1

II. Geraldine: a Tale of Conscience. By E. C. A. 61

III. 1. Lectures on Justification. By John Henry Newman, B.D., Fellow of Oriel College, and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford.

2. The Primitive Doctrine of Justification investigated: relatively to the several Definitions of the Church of Rome and the Church of England; and with a special Reference to the Opinions of the late Mr. Knox, as published in his Remains. By George Stanley Faber, B.D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury 82

IV. 1. Memoir of the Rev. H. Martyn. By the Rev. John Sargent, late Rector of Lavington.

2. Journals and Letters of the Rev. H. Martyn. Edited by Rev. S. Wilberforce, Rector of Brighstone..... 120

V. Memorials of Oxford. By James Ingram, D.D., President of Trinity College........................ 133

VI. The Life of John Jay, First Chief Justice of the United States, and Governor of New York. By his Son, William Jay.. 146

ART. PAGE.

VII. The Prose Works of the Right Rev. Father in God Thomas Ken, D.D., some time Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells; to which are added some of his Letters (never before published), and a short account of his Life. By William Hawkins, Esq., his Executor. The whole collected by James Thomas Round, B.D., Rector of St. Runwald's and St. Nicholas, Colchester, and late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford 167

VIII. Random Recollections of Exeter Hall in 1834—1837. By one of the Protestant Party 190

IX. The Training System adopted in the Model Schools of the Glasgow Educational Society, a Manual for Infant and Juvenile Schools, which includes a System of Moral Training, suited to the condition of large Towns. By David Stow, Esq. one of the Secretaries of the Glasgow Education Society, and Author of "Moral Training." 211

NOTICE OF BOOKS. 230

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
AND
Quarterly Theological Review.

JULY, 1838.

Art. I.—1. *Schleiermacher's Introduction to the Dialogues of Plato.* Translated from the German by William Dobson. 1836.
2. *Initia Philosophiæ Platonicæ.* Auct. Phil. Gul. Van Heusde. 1827—31.

It has become a trite observation of thoughtful men, that in all around us in the present day there is a sound and a movement—a working in the human mind—a stirring in the waters which betokens the approach of some great change. Not only in this country, but throughout the civilized world, there are symptoms of a crisis in opinion as well as in society. The two cannot be separated. Old forms are breaking up, and new are thickening on each other. Wider scenes of action seem opened to practical minds, and deeper mines of thought for speculation. There is in the many an eager restless craving for some vague good, which all anticipate and none define; an exultation at coming prospects; a contempt for the poverty of the past, and the imperfection of the present; a sense of newly awakened powers; a passion for new sympathies and combinations; a general baring and exposure of the human mind, as among men who have cast off restraint and are about to enter together on some great enterprise. And when the current is not rushing forward with an accelerated movement, it is turning in an extraordinary way, and remounting back to its source. Those who think, and those who think not, all seem impressed with something of a mysterious action. And even the few who take no part in the crowd, are sitting with anxious eye watching for the end.

To a philosophical observer, the symptoms of this singular state of the human mind are full of interest; though they may appear in seemingly very insulated facts, and, when connected with the general principle, may sound far-fetched.

One of them is a remarkable phenomenon, which cannot have escaped the observer of general literature. Within the last few years, simultaneously, and without any connection, a general tendency to revive the study of Plato has sprung up in the most intellectual parts of Europe, in Germany, France, and England. In Germany it is returning after a short suspension. In France appearing for the first time. In England recovering slowly, and perhaps never likely to assume a very prominent position, from circumstances, happy circumstances, which supersede its necessity. In Germany, one of its most eloquent advocates, Van Heusde,* has expressly stated the feelings under which he is anxious to restore it. He describes the weariness and disheartened apathy which has followed from the rapid succession of modern theories, each rising on the ruins of its predecessor, standing firm and domineering for a time, and then sinking suddenly into ruin. He seems to feel rather than to acknowledge, that the only security against this dangerous and miserable oscillation of sects and opinions, must be found in the predominance of authority; and he proposes to revive the study of Plato as the philosopher who concentrated most perfectly in his system the excellences of the schools that preceded him, and the sanction of those that have followed. In France, as might naturally be expected† from the state of that unhappy country, where depth of thought has been so rare, and philosophy is just beginning to run the career which in Germany it seems to have completed, the supposed sceptical and eclectical character of Platonism appears chiefly to have excited attention. And by a most remarkable mistake, not indeed uncommon, but which proves how little men have entered into the real spirit and object of Plato's writings, the name of a philosopher, whose whole efforts were systematically and energetically addressed to the establishment of an immutable belief in immutable truths external to man, and guaranteed by the authority of men, has been chosen as the index of a spirit which treats all former systems with contempt, and proposes to raise upon their ruins a new structure of belief based on that, which must overturn itself, the reason of an individual or a section.

In England the study of the Greek philosophy has been chiefly confined to the University of Oxford, which providentially has been saved from setting the seal of its sanction either to Paley or Locke; and has adhered firmly to Aristotle as the text-book in her plan of education. In addition to the soundness and depth of his views, the technical and systematic form of the ethics of Aristotle renders it far fitter for such a purpose than any extant work of any period; and no greater mischief could be done than to abandon it for any other less formal treatise, even for the nobler and more elevating philosophy of Plato himself. Within the last few years, however, more attention has been gradually drawn to the writings of Plato. Unconsciously, and without recognizing fully the extraordinary affinity of his views to the principles which are once more forcing themselves into life, and struggling against the errors of this day, young men especially have been captivated by the grandeur, the warmth, and even the mystical profoundness of his thoughts, so unlike the meanness and coldness and barrenness of our prevailing materialism and rationalism. Plato has been to them in philosophy, what the records of the middle ages are to chronicles of dry facts and to the inventions of fiction, as a middle term between truth and falsehood—reality and poetry. It has amused, elevated, and kindled them into many good affections, but without inspiring confidence. They look on him as a noble enthusiast, full of high feeling, and magnificent fancies, but often condescending to subtleties, which are a mere exercise of ingenuity, and indulging in abstractions too high for any practical application. They do not venture to call him in the words of Bacon "Tumidus poeta, cavillator urbanus, theologus mente captus," but they regard him, as so many writers have done before them, more in the form than in the matter of his works; more as the "Homer of Philosophy,"[*] as "speaking in the language of Jupiter,"[†] as the "master of Demosthenes,"[‡] "in irridendis oratoribus orator summus;"[‖] or to descend still lower, as the biographer of the most interesting character in antiquity, as the Boswell of Socrates—than as the "*Ille Deus Noster*" of the creator of Roman philosophy,[§] as "the truth-loving Plato" of Clement,[¶] as the "Maximus Philosophorum" of Ambrose,[**] as the "Grecian Moses" of Numenius—as, in the words of Augustin, "ille inter discipulos Socratis, qui non immerito excellentissimâ gloriâ claruit, qui omnino cæteros obscuraret,"[††] as the "prudentissimus philosophorum" of Jerome, as the "omnium sapientissimus" of Lactantius,[‡‡] as the "apex columenque philosophorum" of Arnobius, as he who, in the words of Eusebius,[‖‖] "alone of all the Greeks reached to the vestibule of truth and stood upon its threshold"—as the "former of Athanasius,"[§§] and "the converter of Augustin."[¶¶]

---

* Init. Phil. Pl. vol. iii. ch. 1.

† See Cousin's Lectures.

It requires indeed considerable knowledge of the history of philosophy to appreciate the whole influence which Plato has exercised upon the human mind; and, still more, a thorough acquaintance with his works to comprehend their real scope and depth. It is therefore not surprising that such an erroneous estimate of his character should generally prevail; so that, as Schleiermacher well observes,* his brilliant passages should have dazzled the eyes of students, until they forgot that in the mind of Plato these were but resting-stones and reliefs (necessary concessions to human weakness) to enable the mind to ascend to a far higher range of thought.

---

[*] Quintil. lib. x. 1.
[†] Cicero.
[‡] Plutar. in Vit. Mag. p. 1555.
[‖] Cicer. Orat. 1, 11.
[§] Cicer. ad. Att. iv. 16.
[¶] Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 5.
[**] De Obit. Theod. s. 14.
[††] August. de Civit. Dei. lib. 8, c. 8.
[‡‡] De Fals. Rel. lib. 1.
[‖‖] Præp. Evang. l. 13, c. 13.
[§§] Vit. Athana. edit. Bend. vol. i.
[¶¶] Confessions of Augustin.

And yet there are certain eras in the history of human reason, in which the operation of Platonism comes out in a form too striking to permit any doubt of its power, or disrespect to its memory. It was something more than eloquence and fancy which Cicero, perplexed as he sometimes seems to be with the dialectical manœuvres of Plato, discovered in those theories through which he proposed to conduct the spirit of philosophy into Rome. It was not mere ingenuity and abstraction, which induced the Reformers of heathenism to adopt his name, so that, in the words of Augustin†, " recentiores quique philosophi nobilissimi, quibus Plato sectandus placuit, noluerint se dici Peripateticos aut academicos, sed Platonicos." Something more than ordinary reason (and so the wisest Christians always thought) must have informed that spirit which, after lying dormant for three centuries, was resuscitated in the first age of Christianity, and entered into that body of rationalism, which, whether under the name of Gnosticism, or the Alexandrian School, rose up by the side of the true faith to wrestle with it in its untried strength, and to bring out its full form, in precision, by struggles with an antagonist like itself. Once more at the revival of literature Plato was selected as the leader of the new philosophical spirit which was to throw off the yoke of Romanism, and with it the law of Christianity.‡

The revival of deep thought in Germany was in the same manner marked with his name. And in our own country the battle with Hobbes, and the worst forms of philosophical infidelity, was carried on by Cudworth and Smith, and by the deepest of our sound theologians, with the weapons of Plato. A minuter view of the history of human reason would still further illustrate his influence, wherever his philosophy has prevailed. It would suggest also a remarkable comparison between the effects of his system and of that of Aristotle. Wherever Plato has led, he has elevated and improved the human mind. He has been followed too far—farther than Christians may follow him; and many fatal errors have been sheltered under his name. But those which have really sprung from him have been errors of the heart—errors which have not degraded human nature, nor stifled the principle

---

[*] Preface to Introduction to Dialogues.

[†] De Civit. Dei, lib. 8, c. x.

[‡] See Preface of Acciaolus to his translation of Theodoret, Curat. Græc. Affect.

of virtue. Even the scepticism of the later academies offers no exception, for it had no authority whatever in the genuine principles of Plato. Enthusiasm, mysticism, and fanaticism, have been the extravagances of Platonism; coldness, materialism, and scepticism, the perversions of Aristotle. Each, when retained in his proper subordination has been a useful servant to the cause of Christianity. But the work which Plato has performed is far higher than that of Aristotle; one has drilled the intellect—the other disciplined the affections; one aided in sinking deep the truths of Christianity, and expanding its form—the other complicated and entangled its parts by endeavouring to reduce them to system; one supplied materials—the other lent instruments to shape them; one fairly met the enemies of Christianity upon the ground of reason—the other secretly gave way to them, without deserting the standard of authority; one, when it rebelled, rebelled openly, and threw up heresies—the other never rebelled, but engendered and supported corruption.

Notwithstanding these characteristic distinctions, and Degerando in an eloquent passage* will point out still more, it would be as erroneous to oppose the two systems to each other as contradictory poles, as to assert, in the words of Cicero, that their differences are purely verbal. In fundamental principles they agree, as all must agree who study one common nature. They spring from one base, but separate into two heads, rising far above all others, meeting us at every turn as we trace the course of later ages, the fathers as it were of all the great subordinate groups which lie around them—the "two twin peaks," the "bifidum cacumen" of the Greek and of human philosophy.

In the empire which Aristotle and Plato severally and successively enjoyed over the human mind, they possessed many advantages in common. They were both, to use even Bacon's words as taken from the midst of his coarsest abuse, among the most gifted of mankind, "inter maxima mortalium ingenia." Both were profound observers, and observers of those facts which come home to all our bosoms, and interest all ages, because they lie at the root of all science and all life, the facts of human nature. Both more or less were thrown upon the resources of their own reason—cut off by local revolutions and the "spirit of the age" from immediate connection with the great deposits of Oriental tradition, and compelled, like men upon a desert island, to frame a habitation for their reason from chance materials on the spot, and fragments of scattered wreck. Greek philosophy is in fact the perfection of pure rationalism—from this it derived its energy, and in this, rightly employed, we find its value.

As rationalism, it necessarily took the form of system, at least in the mind of its author. Every part which did not fasten into and cohere with the primary hypothesis, was necessarily rejected. Every connection between truths was marked and brought to light. The whole chain of dependent facts was evolved and laid out to be examined; the most delicate shades of truth and falsehood were scrupulously distinguished; and since, for the satisfaction of reason, and in the absence of external authority, no science could exist without demonstration, not only was the whole building solidly and formally cemented, but every stone was rung before it was fixed in its place. It is this accurate technical systematic form which gives the Greek philosophy its great utility in education, or rather makes it essential to any sound scheme of education. It can be found no where else; and without it we could no more teach the science of morals, even possessing, as we do, all its great truths laid down in the Scriptures, than we could instruct in philology by the works of orators and poets without grammars, or teach religion to the young by the Bible without catechisms and articles. To speak of system, indeed, as applied to the works of Plato, will sound very strange to those who have only seen them bit by bit, and probably from a false position. They seem a collection of fragments—here a line and there a line—hint and hypothesis, doubt and dogmatism, feeling and reason, cold mathematical abstraction, and the most gorgeous poetry, the drama and the lecture, the serious and ridiculous, all thrown together with a hand careless in the profuseness of its riches. They bear no more resemblance to the rigid form, determinate proportion, and sharp clear outline of the treatises of Aristotle, than the rough shapeless splashes of scene-painting, to the finish and precision of a miniature. And yet there is art in each—more art and more system in the scene than in the miniature. In the one indeed it lies open to every eye; in the other it is concealed in the artist's mind; and not till he places us in the position from which we are intended to see it, and the portions are properly arranged, and the lights are duly thrown, will those rude unsightly daubings shape themselves into life and beauty.*

---

* Systemes de la Philosop. vol. ii.

This remark leads to another advantage in the Greek philosophy, the exquisite beauty of its form. Whether it was climate, or natural temperament, or education, or social circumstances, that gave to the Greeks their delicate perception of universal beauty, no people ever existed in whose happiness it was so necessary an ingredient, or to whom it was so profusely ministered by the genius of their composers. Their whole nature was in some sort sensualized. And truth stripped of grace and music could no more reach their mind, than religion could touch their heart, except as veiled under a gorgeous mythology. Much of what has been called the poetry of Plato is a concession to this popular weakness. Its occasional extravagance, especially as exhibited in the Phædrus, is an intentional and avowed satire. But the dramatic vividness of the dialogue, the harmony of rhythm, the full calm flow of thought and language, and the bursts of passionate inspiration which make Plato the "Homer of Philosophers"—these are all his own—a simple unaffected effluence from his own nature—the instinctive, unconscious creation of an ardent and susceptible mind, gifted not only with a national acuteness of taste, but brought, by the very theory which possessed it, to that feeling and temper from which neither discord nor meanness can flow, and by which every word is grace, because every thought is goodness. Even Aristotle is not destitute of this grace of external form. But it is of a totally different character,—cold, colourless, and still, like the oldest and grandest Grecian sculpture; nothing rich, nothing superfluous; the words clinging to the thoughts like moistened drapery to a marble statue, and giving beauty by transparency alone. Still there is beauty of form, and beauty in perfect harmony with the thoughts which it clothes. And how entirely this principle of correspondence prevails, cannot be better seen than by imagining the syllogisms of Aristotle loaded with the robings of Plato, and the grand flowing thoughts of Plato left bare beneath the thin veil of Aristotle.

---

* This illustration is borrowed from a fact: a person went behind the scenes of Drury Lane on the night of a splendid melodrama. In crossing the stage he stumbled over a great board, over which some one apparently had emptied a bucket of red paint, and mopped it off with ink and water. He was on the point of kicking it away, when the scene-shifter cried out in an agony, "Sir, Sir, take care, what are you about there, that's *the bridge*, Sir—Mr. Stanfield's bridge—its the thing that draws the houses." And when he went back to the boxes, he discovered the ruin which he was on the point of causing, by destroying the most striking feature in a landscape worthy of a Claude. Let men, young men especially, remember that there are many such bridges in Plato, and place themselves in the boxes before they purpose to kick them away.

This beauty of external form is not the least—it is perhaps the greatest source of the influence of the Grecian philosophy. It is also a peculiar condition required in an instrument of education. Those at least will acknowledge this, who believe with Plato in the close harmony of soul and body; in the analogy of beauty to itself wherever it really exists, in sound or language, colour or feeling, proportion or virtue; in the identity of real beauty and real goodness, and therefore in the necessity of providing for the young, as our Maker has provided for us, an external creation of loveliness to be the type and monitor and preparation for an internal creation of virtue.

"We must seek out," he says in the Republic,[*] "for those who are to supply us with the forms of art, men who, by instinct, can

[*] Lib. 3, p. 102.

trace out the springs of grace and beauty; that dwelling as in a sanctuary of health, the young may imbibe good from all around them—from every work and sight and sound, whence aught may strike their sense—like airs that are wafting health from purest climes, and step by step from childhood are changing them into the image of goodness, and into likeness, and love, and harmony with the beauty of truth."

These few observations may point out generally why the state of Grecian philosophy in our great schools of Christian education requires to be diligently watched; and in some degree why the course which it takes indicates, like a float upon the water, the direction of the current of the times. It is the great instrument of education still. It always has been the great stimulus to the activity of the human mind. The study of it has gone hand in hand with advancing civilization. The loss of it has been followed by decay not only in science, but in art, and in all things to which art ministers.

We may, on a future occasion, trace out this remarkable fact historically. We may also examine the various relations which have at different periods existed between the Greek Philosophy and Christianity; and ascertain the true principles upon which an alliance may be established between them with safety and advantage to each. The former question would supply the answer to the wretched and ignorant clamour in behalf of "physical science and useful knowledge" as a substitute in education for the Greek Philosophy. The latter will not be necessary so long as the Church of England retains her true position, and insensibly preserves the balance between her several faculties and functions by recognizing external authority as a control over individual opinion. It is the operation of this great maxim which has easily and secretly hitherto, but most efficaciously, enabled the University of Oxford to exercise her students in the very centre of scepticism—in systems founded wholly on rationalism, and therefore full of the poison, without risking any infection. She has taught them to reason and prove, without making reason and proof essential conditions of belief. She has inspired them with reverence for heathens, without forgetting themselves to be Christians. She has put into their hands the weapons which have so often been turned against the truth, without tempting their employment against herself. And the humility, sobriety and thoughtfulness which her course of study has stamped upon their characters, both in religion and in social life, is the best answer to the problem of Tertullian, which can be solved in no other way.

" Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? Quid Academiæ et Ecclesiæ? quid hæreticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de Porticu Salomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat Dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quærendum.

Viderint qui Stoicum, et Platonicum, et Dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt."—*Tertull. de Præscript.*

Without however entering further into this question at present, it may not be uninteresting to point out some of those peculiar principles in the philosophy of Plato, which seem in England to have found a congenial soil in the spirit of the present day, and which, simultaneously indeed, but under far other circumstances than in Germany and France, will probably take root and spread.

In England Plato will not be selected as our guide, because we want authority for moral truth, for we possess such authority already, far higher and far more conclusive than any testimony of his—in the witness of the Church. Nor will his name be advanced as a sanction for that foolish eclectical vanity which would place itself in the centre of all systems, like a low-born usurper in the midst of conquered sovereigns, to judge, condemn, applaud, or ridicule, taking from each what we choose, and casting off the rest in scorn; while all truth is subjected to the test of our arbitrary fancies, and far wiser men than ourselves are insulted by our contemptuous independence. This is the eclectical spirit which it is proposed to revive in France—very different from the eclectical maxims of the Alexandrian school, which sought in different systems for one common acknowledged stock of truth, rather than for community in error; and directly opposed to Plato, who combined indeed much from others, but never lost sight of an hereditary doctrine, on which all others were to be engrafted, whether he traced it openly to the East, or revived it without name from Pythagoras.

To take from a competent authority a system which may afterwards be enlarged or modified, or defined by experience and by the testimony of others, but which in every inquiry is the basis upon which the enlargement proceeds, is a wise and a necessary rule. It is the process of nature in the development of the understanding, just as much as in the expansion of the embryo body. The whole oak lies hid in the acorn, but its fibres shoot out and spread by assimilating to themselves the nutriment which lies about its roots.

This is sound eclecticism. But to acknowledge no leading system—to receive nothing from authority—to become what Bacon erroneously desired, while he confessed that it had never existed, "of so constant and severe a mind as to have determined and tasked ourselves utterly to abolish theories and common notions, and to apply our intellect altogether smoothed and even to particulars anew;" this, which is the plan contemplated in the rationalistic eclecticism of France, and is very much affected by all men in this age, in pure wilfulness, without the pretensions of philosophy, is as impossible from the nature of man, as it would be destructive to all knowledge whatever. We may as well expect a tree to spring up except from a seed, or a man to accumulate wealth with neither capital nor credit to commence with.

In England, at least so long as the education of the English nation is carried on by the Church, we shall not tolerate any such absurdities. We shall not prohibit, but rather encourage all experiment, all reasoning, all proof, all additions to our knowledge which really are additions. But we shall not launch men upon the sea without giving them charts, and compasses, and sounding lines. We shall not expect them to move on without some firm foundation to move upon. We shall not call upon them to grow while we are cutting off their roots, or to become rich while we are reducing them to poverty. We shall ensure them a capital of knowledge, and that knowledge will be Christianity—and Christianity as it is countersigned, and guaranteed by the best of all possible securities, the witness of the Church.

This then is the spirit in which all philosophy may be made a most valuable instrument of education—Grecian philosophy especially, in an education, whose subject is man in his relation to the spiritual world—and Platonism most of all at a time when a vast harvest of follies are springing up in the country, precisely the same as those, against which his highest powers were directed, and which must be crushed and rooted out by the whole force of truth and reason, whether by the truth of God in revelation, or by the reason of man in philosophy.

No men have more mistaken the nature of Plato's system, than those who have regarded it as a speculative fabric, such as men of powerful intellect have wrought out at times in schools and cloisters, when the tranquillity of society enabled them to think, without any necessity for action. Much, if not all, of the Eastern philosophy was of this caste. It sprung up like a tree in the desert, very beautiful, but very useless, under an atmosphere fixed and changeless, perfect in all its outlines from the absence of any thing to disturb it. Such also was much of the new Alexandrian speculations, until Julian brought them to bear practically upon the purification of the Heathen Polytheism. Such also was scholasticism, and many of the rival theories which have since sprung up in Germany under the stimulus of a craving curiosity, which found nothing to do but to think. The questions which would naturally form the materials of such philosophers are candidly and almost ludicrously stated by Kant.*

"Utrum mundus initium habeat, et terminum quempiam extensionis in spatio; utrum uspiam, et fortasse in memetipso cogitante individua quædam unitas sit, atque incorruptibilis, an nihil sit, nisi dividuum et caducum; utrum in actionibus liber sim, an quemadmodum naturæ cæteræ, ad filum naturæ ducar fatique; utrum denique suprema mundi causa exstet, an res naturales, earumque ordo in re objectâ ultimâ versentur, in quâ in omnibus deliberationibus nostris consistendum nobis sit, quæstiones sunt illæ quidem, cum quarum solutione universam scientiam suam mathematicus libenter commutaret, quippe quæ ratione summorum gravissimorumque finium generi humano propositorum, nil quidquam potest aperire in quo acquiescat."

---

* Artis. Element. p. 2, lib. 2, c. 2.

One might have thought that this was but a poor and barren field for a mighty genius to expatiate in,—that but one answer could be found to these problems; and that one very simple and brief, within our own consciousness or our own ignorance;—that life, which is short to learn, is very long to feel in, and an absolute eternity to act in;—and that in the miseries of life, and the agonies of death, what we may feel and what we ought to do, are the high and awful questions, the "summi gravissimique fines" proposed to the knowledge of mankind. Even the heathen Persius could tell us better the end of man's philosophy.

> "Quid sumus, et quidnam victuri gignimur? ordo
> Quis datus? et metæ mollis quis flexus, et unde?
> Quis modus argento? quid fas optare? quid asper
> Utile nummus habet? Patriæ charisque propinquis
> Quantum elargiri debet? Quem te Deus esse
> Jussit, et humanâ quâ parte locatus es in re."
>
> *Pers. Satyr.*

And Plato thought so likewise; and to these abstract speculatists themselves, and to others who have ranked him with them, the Ritters, and Schleiermachers, and Cousins, and Dejerandos, who valuable as their commentaries are, seem all to have fallen into this error, he would answer in the words of Augustin,

> "Quo pacto anima tua, tam docta et ingeniosa (ubi te multum dolemus) per hæc mysteria doctrinæ ad Deum suum, id est a quo facta est, non cum quo facta est, nec cujus portio, sed cujus conditio, nec qui est omnium anima, sed qui fecit omnem animam, quo solo illustrante fit anima beata, si ejus gratiæ non sit ingrata, hoc modo potest pervenire."*

We shall never understand the value of Plato's philosophy, and still less the arrangement and dependence of its parts, without viewing it in this light, as a practical, not a speculative system. Even considered as a revival of the modified doctrine of Pythagoras, which probably is the true point of view, it is still practical. Pythagoras was full of other thoughts than the abstract relations of numbers, when he organized his wonderful society to restore something of right government and religious subordination in the republics of Magna Græcia. He was as far from dreaming away his reason in empty metaphysics, though high and abstract truth was a necessary condition of his system, as Loyola was from resting in the subtleties of scholastic theology, when he created his singular polity for upholding the Romanist faith.*

---

* De Civit. Dei, lib. 7.

Plato's great object was man. He lived with man, felt as a man, held intercourse with kings, interested himself deeply in the political revolutions of Sicily, was the pupil of one whose boast it was, to have brought down philosophy from heaven to earth, that it might raise man up from earth to heaven; and, above all, he was a witness and an actor in the midst of that ferment of humanity exhibited in the democracy of Athens. When states are at peace, and property secure, and the wheels of common life move on regularly and quietly upon their fixed lines, men with active minds may sit and speculate upon the stars, or analyze ideas. But it is not so in the great convulsions of society. The object constantly before the eyes of Plato was the incorporated spirit, the *μέγα θϱέμμα*† of human lawlessness. He saw it indeed in an exhausted state, its power passed away, its splendour torn off, and all the sores and ulcers‡ which former demagogues had pampered and concealed, now laid bare and beyond cure. But it was still a spectacle to absorb the mind of every good and thoughtful man. The state of the Athenian democracy is the real clue to the philosophy of Plato. It would be proved, if by nothing else, by one little touch in the Republic. The Republic is the summary of his whole system, and the keystones of all the other dialogues are uniformly let into it. But the object of the Republic is to exhibit the misery of man let loose from law, and to throw out a general plan for making him subject to law, and thus to perfect his nature. It is exhibited on a large scale in the person of a State, and in the masterly historical sketch which in the 8th & 9th books he draws of the changes of society, having painted in the minutest detail the form of a licentious democracy, he fixes it by the slightest allusion, (it was perhaps all that he could hazard,) on the existing state of Athens; and then passes on to a frightful prophecy of that tyranny which would inevitably follow. All the other dialogues bring us to the Republic, and the Republic brings us to this as its end and aim.

On this view every part of his system will fall naturally into place. Even questions apparently farthest from any practical intention are thus connected with his plan. If in the Sophist he indulges in the most subtle analysis of our notion of being, it is to overthrow the fundamental fallacy of that metaphysical school which was denying all virtue by confounding all truth, and thus poisoning human nature at its source, and justifying the grossest crimes both of the state and of its leaders.* If he returns again and again to his noble theory of Ideas, it is to fix certain immutable distinctions of right and wrong, good and evil; and to raise up the mind to the contemplation of a Being of perfect goodness, prior in existence, superior in power, unamenable in its independence to those fancies and passions of mankind, which had become before the eyes of Plato, in individuals, unbridled lusts, and in the state an insanity of tyranny. If in the Parmenides he takes us into the abstrusest mysteries of metaphysics, the nature of unity and number—this also was rendered necessary, not only to obviate objection to his own theory of ideas, but to fix the great doctrine of unity in a Divine Being—unity in goodness—one truth in action and thought,—as opposed to that polytheism of reason which makes every man's conscience his god. It grappled also with a mystery which meets us at the foundation of every deep theory, and in the forms of every popular belief, in Christianity as well as in heathenism; a mystery which true in itself as wholly distinct from man, has yet a corresponding mystery in the constitution of the human mind—and which compelled even the heathen philopher to state the same seeming paradox for the very foundation of his system, which Christianity lays down at once as its grand and all comprehensive doctrine. All unity implies plurality—all plurality must end in unity. So also the inquiry in the Theætetus into the nature of science bore no resemblance whatever in its object to any mere speculative theories of Kant or his followers. It was a necessary part of that system which was to become the antagonist of the Sophists, and to contend for the preservation of truth against a ruinous sensualism and empiricism, which was sapping all the foundations of society. Even the seemingly frivolous and often wearisome subtleties which occur in the Sophist, the Euthydemus, and the Politicus, are intended as dialectical exercises for the pupil whom Plato is forming to become the saviour and guardian of a state. Even the philological absurdities of the Cratylus are to be explained in the same way. He perpetually suggests the fact in the dialogues themselves. And in the Republic† he gives at length the principles on which they are introduced.

---

* See Meisner, Histoire de l'Origine des Sciences dans la Greece, for a very interesting view of the school of Pythagoras, and one which gives a very useful introduction to the school of Plato.

† Repub. lib. 6, p. 219.

‡ Gorgias, p. 109.

Very much of the plan of his dialogues, for reasons which he himself supplies, and which it will occur to mention hereafter, is purposely left in obscurity. And the test of the statement here made must lie in a careful reference to the works themselves.

---

* Gorgias, 1.

† B, 7.

But it is impossible to believe that Plato, the "first of philosophers," who made practical goodness and duty the one great end of life, whose whole history, as well as his theories, are full of views not of speculative fancies but of practical improvement to society,*—the friend of Dion, the adviser of Dionysius, the pupil of Socrates, the writer of the Republic and the Laws, who recognized indeed intellect and truth as necessary conditions of man's perfection, but made "the good and the beautiful" his heart and his affections, the ruling principle of his actions—who never looked down upon minds beneath him without thinking of the task of education; and never raised his eyes to that image of the Deity which he had formed from all imaginable perfection, without seeing in it not merely an abstraction of intellect, unity, identity, eternity, but goodness and love, and justice—the† Maker of the world, because he delighted in the happiness of his creatures; the Dispenser of rewards beyond the‡ grave;§ the Cause of all good things—the Father and King of all;—it is impossible to believe that such a man, with strong affections, consummate devotion to his end, absolute unity of purpose inculcated in all his doctrines, and exhibited in the outlines of his work, should have stood before any scene of humanity, least of all before the spectacle of an Athenian democracy, without having his whole soul possessed by man and the relations of man, instead of things and the relations of things—that he should have wasted those powers, so elevated and so pure, in idle subtleties—that he should have thrown out his fancies in fragments as one whose life was aimless—or that wrought as they are in every line with a consummate art, linked together to the observing eye by ten thousand of the finest reticulations, they were not intended as a system; and as a system will come out to us when the focus is rightly adjusted, and the whole is regarded as a mighty effort to elevate man to his perfection, and his perfection where only it can be reached, in a social and political form.

We are most anxious to fix attention on this point, (let it be a fancy—take it as hypothesis, only try it,) because wherever it has been lost (and we cannot name the commentator who has wholly found it) the whole of Plato's works have been viewed in inextricable confusion. Even Schleiermacher has failed in his clue. Men seem to have wandered about as in a maze—here admiring, there perplexed—there completely at a stand. No order—no limits—no end. Fragments have been dealt with as wholes, and wholes as fragments; irony mistaken for earnestness, and earnestness for irony; play for the fancy gravely dealt with as meditation for the reason, and exercises for boys treated as the serious occupation of men. Spurious pieces have been admitted which destroyed all consistency of thought. Doubts raised to remove error or rouse curiosity have been carried off as final decisions, until Plato, the very dogmatist of philosophy, has been made the ringleader of Pyrrhonists and Sceptics. And even the holiest and purest of ethics, which never stopped short of its object till man's mind was withdrawn from* sense and his heart was fixed upon its God, has been calumniated and perverted.

---

* Conviv. p. 260.

† Timæus.

‡ Phæd.

§ Republic, b. x.

But take this central position—look as a philosopher on man, and on man in his whole personality, as a living immortal soul, instinct with affection and feeling, which cannot rest except in beings like himself. See him vainly struggling to realize that noble creation for which he was formed at first, and to raise up a polity or church in the faculties of his own nature, and from the members of civil society—then contemplate the wreck of such a plan in the contaminated youth and remorseless tyranny of the Athenian commonwealth—all that was noble in its nature, its "lion heart" and "human reason,"† "starved, emaciated, and degraded;" and the "many-headed monster of its passions," *πολυκεφαλὸν θρέμμα*, "howling round and tearing it to pieces"—and then a new light will fall upon the meaning and order of those works, which were intended to do all that mere philosophy could do—to raise a solemn protest against the sins which it witnessed; to overthrow the sophistries which pandered to those corruptions; to open a nobler scene; and to create some yearning for its attainment in those few untainted minds which nature had prepared for its enjoyment.

In this view all will be clear—the grand close of all the dialogues in the Republic and Laws; the striking mode in which all the rest are worked into these two; the commencement of them in the Phædrus, and the perfect consistency of that piece, in any other view so wild and heterogeneous; the deep melancholy tone which pervades every allusion of Plato to the scenes before his eyes; the anticipation of coming evil; the sort of prophetic elevation as he opens his "dream" of that city, wherein all goodness should dwell—"whether‡ such has ever existed in the infinity of days gone by, or even now exists in some regions of the East far from our sight and knowledge, or will be perchance hereafter"—but "which,§ though it be not on earth, must have a pattern of it laid up in heaven, for him who wishes to behold it, and beholding resolves to dwell there."

So also we shall enter into the educational character of his works; their high practical morality, the mode in which every question is carried up into the nature of truth, and through truth is connected with virtue—the position which theology occupies, and the practical mode in which it is applied; the absence of those abstract metaphysical speculations on the nature of the Deity, into which human reason always falls when it analyzes mental conceptions beyond what practical duty requires; and into which the Neo-Platonicians did fall, and still more the Gnostics, while they boasted of their own ingenuity, and ridiculed Plato as one who had not, like them, penetrated "into the depths of the Intelligible Essence."*

---

* Phæd. † Repub. b. 9, p. 345. ‡ Ib. b. 6, p. 228. § Ib. b. 9, p. 349.

Even the form of Plato's works will derive new light and beauty from considering them as instruments of instruction, not vehicles for speculation. The mode in which curiosity is roused by the fractured lines of the dialogue; the arresting the attention by demanding an answer to every position; the gradual opening of difficulties; the carrying of the eye and imagination to the truth by portions of broken winding stairs of argument, leading to dark recesses, and ruinously hung together in masses, rather than the throwing open before the reader an easy ascending plane, which requires no labour, and stimulates no thought—So also the successive overthrow of opinions—the sudden starting up of doubts in apparently the most open ground—the skill with which the drama of the argument is broken up into scenes and acts, heightened by a stage decoration, and relieved with the solemn or the grotesque—the rich melo-dramatic myths which so often close them—the character of Socrates himself embodying the attributes and duties of the Greek chorus—the selection of the parties among the young—the tests which are applied to ascertain if they possess the qualities of mind, which, in the Republic,† are declared to be necessary for those who are to make any progress in goodness—the gradual development of the system in exact proportion to the industry and ingenuity of the hearer—and the order of the sceptical dialogues, all more or less destructive of errors without any declaration of the truth, and forming series of enigmas, to lead like an avenue of sphinxes to the grand open portal of the republic—all these and many other points will assume a wholly different character, whether we consider Plato's work as intended to declare his opinions, or as constructed for the purpose of extricating, by a tried and thoughtful process, the minds which it was still possible to save from the follies and sins and miseries in which the madness of the age and a vicious system of education were plunging them.

All this to persons who never read Plato, or read him carelessly and contemptuously, as men in this day do read whatever they do not understand, at the first glimpse will appear exaggerated and enthusiastic. And no answer can be given but a demand that the trial should be made—and the hypothesis taken as a clue. If it is false, it will fail. But none whom wise men would wish to follow have ever approached the name of Plato without reverence and gratitude. All have been impressed especially with his exquisite skill as an artist or constructor of his works;* and none have drawn a plan which gives harmony and symmetry to them all. Some plan however must exist. If we want to form a judgment on the grandeur of some vast cathedral, we do not plant ourselves in a nook, before some disproportioned arch, or out of sight of the central aisle. We seek for that point of view in which the builder himself beheld it before he commenced the work, and then the whole fabric comes out. And the illustration will bear to be dwelt on. Whoever studies Plato is treading on holy ground. So heathens always felt it. So even Christianity confessed.† And we may stand among his venerable works as in a vast and consecrated fabric—vistas and aisles of thoughts opening on every side—high thoughts that raise the mind to heaven—pillars and niches and cells within cells mixing in seeming confusion, and a veil of tracery, and foliage, and grotesque imagery thrown over all, but all rich with a light streaming "through dim religious forms"—all leading up to God—all blest with an effluence from Him, though an effluence dimmed and half lost in the contaminated reason of man.

---

* Porph. Vit. Plat. c. 14.

† B. 7.

The early Church never looked on the pure and elevated truths scattered through the Grecian philosophy, and especially in the works of Plato, without recognizing in them an emanation, more or less direct, from the "fountain of all wisdom."

> "If they argue," says Clement, "it was by accident the Greeks gave utterance to portions of true philosophy, that accident was the work of a divine economy; for, with all their rivalship against us, no one will make accident a god. If by some strange coincidence, the coincidence itself is providential. If they assert that the Greeks possessed a natural intuition of truth, we know but one author of nature, even God; as we know but one author of righteousness, and yet speak of a natural righteousness as distinct from the righteousness by Christ. If that they shared in one common intellect, who is the father of this? If they speak of supernatural enunciations, these are but forms of prophecy. Others declare that those philosophers saw indeed truths, but only in reflections and shadows. Is it the less true for this? What does the divine Apostle say of ourselves? 'For now we see through a glass darkly.' And so they among the Greeks, who attained to the truths of philosophy, saw the Divine Nature, though only in far shadows and reflections; and yet such shadows and reflections, which are all that we are now capable of perceiving, partake nevertheless of truth, as reflections which are formed in water." (*Clement. Alexand. Strom.* b. i. p. 316.)

This is the substance of one of the most condensed views on the relation of heathen philosophy to revealed truth which occurs in the early fathers. A still more eloquent passage is found in Theodoret, and though long, it is worth transcribing. Any thing which can bring us to the study of such a writer as Plato with a sober reverential feeling, divested of that flippancy and conceit which must distort all our notions, and render our minds inaccessible to any sound elevated doctrines, is well worth a little delay. And the passages are not the less valuable because with the respect which they profess they carry also the antidote to any exaggerated submission to an authority other than the Church.

---

* Schleiermacher, Introd. Preface.

† Clem. Alex. l. i. p. 39, 316; Theodoret, Græc. Aff. lib. i. et passim.

"Go then," says Theodoret, "to the Greeks, go to your own philosophers, who initiate you before we do; and who teach what we would teach you. For they are like to those birds of song which imitate the voice of man, but know not the meaning of the words they utter. Even so these reason indeed of the things belonging unto God, though they know little of the truths whereof they speak. And yet they are not without excuse. They enjoyed no succession of prophets, passing the torch of truth from hand to hand; no apostolic illumination to be a light to their feet and a lantern to their paths. Nature alone was their teacher, though her handwriting, engraven on the heart by the finger of God, the wanderings of a sinful life long since obliterated. And yet some remains of this, He, who first stamped it on their souls, renewed at times, and allowed them not wholly to perish, by displaying to mankind, through his works, his providence and power. And thus the Apostle has shown in his sermon at Lystra, where, in addition to much else, he says, 'Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless, he left not himself without witness in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.'

"The seed of Abraham," he proceeds, "received the oracles of God, and enjoyed the grace of the teaching of his prophets. The other nations, through the works of nature and the creation, were led to a knowledge of their God by Him who is Lord of all things. And as in his wonderful bounty he sends his rain, chiefly indeed on the cultivated soil, and that for the service of man, and yet, from the abundance of his goodness, he waters even the deserts and the mountains; and the land which man has ploughed brings forth a perfect fruit, and that which he has not laboured brings forth wild fruit; and we see at times the fig-tree shooting forth upon tombs and among ruins; even so the grace of knowledge, in a more peculiar manner, is given to holy men, and yet even to others it is vouchsafed, as rain to the wilderness and forest; and hence even there fruits spring up that are fit for food, and are like to the produce of the plough. And yet it is easy to see that they have never been blessed by the culture of God's prophets, for there is a roughness mingled within them and a gall of bitterness; and they who know how to discern between the good and the evil gather that which is fit for use and the rest they leave, as they who gather roses leave the thorns behind, but collect the blossoms. And such also is the instinct of the bees, for they settle not only on the sweet but on the bitter flowers, and the sweetness they extract and the bitterness they eschew; and from qualities most contrary, bitter and sour, and rough and sharp, they prepare sweetest honey for man. And these we also imitate. And from those fields of your philosophy, so full of bitterness, we provide the sweet honey for your salvation. And as they that heal our bodies concoct from venomous beasts drugs that will heal their wounds, and even from the flesh of vipers can extract antidotes to disease, so we also take in hand the works of your poets and historians and philosophers, and rejecting some parts as noxious and concocting others with the sound word of our doctrine, we apply the healing medicine to your souls." (*Theodoret. Græc. Affec. Curat.* lib. 1.)

It would be easy to collect many more passages of the same import, and others still more immediately connecting the great truths of the Platonic philosophy with an anterior revelation, and especially with the books of Moses. Justin, Clement, Eusebius, and others, speak of it as an acknowledged fact. Aristobulus, the Jewish peripatetic, asserted the same thing. And although both Jerome and Augustin have chronologically refuted the notion that he had enjoyed direct communication with certain of the prophets, there are scattered throughout his works such singular coincidences with Scripture, not merely such as might spring up spontaneously in different minds, viewing human nature from one common point, but seemingly borrowed and transferred, as might at least easily reconcile an attentive reader to an hypothesis of the kind.

Our object, however, at present is to apply the suggestion which has been thrown out as to the practical character of Plato's writings, to a more detailed examination of the writings themselves, in the conviction that no little good may be done by assisting in turning the attention of the generation now entering into life to the largest and noblest treasure-house existing in human literature, whether of eloquence, of beauty, of elevated moral principles, of profound metaphysics, or of political wisdom. Schleiermacher has done more than any one to throw the dialogues into an intelligible order. If we think that he has not perfectly succeeded in obtaining the precise clue to their perplexities, something must be allowed to a prejudice in favour of a different hypothesis. No admirers of Plato can be insensible to the assistance which Schleiermacher, Ritter, Ast, Tenneman, Van Heusde, and many other foreign critics have rendered to the study of his system. But there is something in the atmosphere which we breathe that modifies all our views, as it colours the objects of vision. And the deep metaphysical character of the later philosophical schools of Germany seems to have given an undue bias to their mind when examining the philosophy of the Greeks. Van Heusde has some sensible remarks on the necessity of guarding against this tendency to see all things after one fashion, and to interpret the writings of others, of men often in the most opposite circumstances, as if they had always looked through our own eyes. He compares it, not infelicitously, to the romance writers of the middle ages, who represented Cæsar and Alexander the Great travelling the country as knight-errants.

Schleiermacher has well pointed out the utter futility of all the old attempts to arrange the Dialogues in any consistent plan. The forms of trilogies and tetralogies which could not even be generally completed, and which, in the few instances of completion, brought together the most opposite subjects without even a common plot, may be rejected at once. The idea is valuable only in one point of view, as expressing strongly a conviction of the dramatic nature of the dialogues. The classification of them by their logical character, as "dogmatic, refutative, or tentative," and the like, is indeed by no means to be despised. On the contrary, it is one of the most important clues to a full understanding of their relative position. But it is not sufficient, because it embraces only the form of the works without touching on the matter. And although in Plato's system the two are inseparably connected, almost as body and mind, the matter must occupy by far the most prominent place. It must supply the basis of the arrangement. The attempt to form a chronological series is still more vain. We have no external testimony to guide us, except in one or two cases. Internal evidence there is none, for the narrative is full of anachronisms so glaring as to be evidently intentional; and the conjectures which may be drawn from an altered tone of sentiment or style must be open to all the vagueness of the rashest criticism. How little any such judgment can be trusted may be gathered from the extreme difficulty of distinguishing between the spurious and genuine dialogues, and also from the glaring mistakes which have occurred in them already, from a misunderstanding of the object of the several parts. Even if we knew the dates of the publication of each dialogue it would assist us but little in fixing the order in which they should be read; for any man with a system ready formed in his mind will throw it out portion by portion, according as the train of thought may happen to present itself. Such a work is

---

[*] We cannot allude to Schleiermacher's introduction, which has been recently translated into English, without lamenting in one instance the perfect fidelity of the translator. It is generally considered one of the most harsh and unreadable books in the German language, and in its present form it stands, undoubtedly, at the head of the same class of books in this country. It has lost nothing of its pre-eminence of obscurity.

not like the erection of a house, in which the foundation must in time precede the walls, and the walls be raised before the roof. It is rather like the planting an estate, and where we begin and where we end may depend on the accident of the moment, without any departure from the original plan.

The artist-like development of the philosophical system is the principle in which Schleiermacher, with great skill and insight into the character of the Platonic writings, has proposed to arrange them; and this consideration must have great weight in every attempt of the kind. The main outlines of such a plan must coincide with that which would be formed in more direct reference to the practical object of Plato. Still we think that the connection will be more easy, and the series more natural, and, in particular, (that which constitutes the great difficulty,) the parts of each several dialogue will arrange themselves in greater consistency by bearing in mind throughout that the young men of Athens were the persons to whom they were expressly addressed; that the purification of their morals—the refutation of their corruptors, the sophists—the elevation of the standard of private and political morality—the laying a firm foundation for a new national character—the cleansing, or endeavouring to cleanse, that Augean stable of the Grecian democracy—and the opening a new world of thought and feeling, as yet hidden behind the veil of a gross sensualistic polytheism,—that these, and not merely the foundation of a metaphysical school, or the development and propagation of barren truth, were constantly before the mind of Plato, guiding his thought and his pen throughout, and offering the only explanation to those innumerable mysteries and anomalies which meet us in every page of his works—which have made many men abandon them in despair, some play with them as a complicated enigma, others ridicule them as an unintelligible chaos, a whole succession of philosophical schools claim him as the champion of their scepticism, and even Cicero himself declare that " Plato never hazards an assertion, but argues on both sides " of the question, and then leaves the reader in his doubt."

It is this view also of the subject which places Plato in such direct contrast to Aristotle, especially in their ethical treatises. Aristotle expressly declares that he writes not for the young but for the old.* Plato's argument is chiefly carried on in the form of conversation with youth. Hence Aristotle's reasoning is synthetic, commencing with principles too high for undisciplined minds to understand. Plato's is wholly analytic, grappling at once with prejudices and follies, and purifying truth from error, by sifting it and bringing it to the light. The form of Aristotle

* Nicom. Eth. b. i. c. 3.

is grave, simple, and such as would become a philosopher addressing philosophers. Plato is full of every art to captivate the fancy, winning, dramatic, eloquent, full of digression, now relieving the mind by the most playful humour, now rising into solemnity and poetry; always striking, always impressed with the necessity of condescending to an unformed hearer.

There cannot be a more striking instance of these characteristics, nor a more complete argument in proof of the hypothesis suggested, than the first dialogue, with which, by common consent, the series must open—the Phædrus. Historically we know from Diogenes, that this was the first in order of publication. Internally it contains the germ of all the others. And there is no part of the Platonic philosophy of which the seed may not be found carefully introduced into this singular, and, at first sight, perplexing composition. The same fact has been inferred from the poetical and overcharged style of several portions of it; but as in many other instances the commentator (Dionysius) has entirely mistaken an intentional caricature for a serious and elaborate production. Even Schleiermacher seems to have fallen into the same error. The conclusion is just, that the Phædrus is the first of the dialogues; the premises are false, that the date is betrayed by a juvenile extravagance of style. Such an extravagance undoubtedly exists; but when the object of the dialogue is examined on the principle which it is proposed to employ, it will be found perfectly consistent with the utmost severity of thought. From the Phædrus all the other dialogues run out through a series of sceptical unconclusive disputations, to four great works of an entirely different character, grave, massive, dogmatic, and final—the Republic, the Laws, the Timæus, and the unfinished fragment of the Critias. These four form one grand group openly connected together. And there is not a question left unsettled in any one of the former dialogues which does not find its solution here, a solution unmixed with a particle of doubt, thrown off frequently in a single sentence, without condescending, as it were, to inquire if any doubt ever had existed; at other times carrying back the mind by some little touch which only an attentive reader would observe, to former unfinished discussions on the same subject, and by completing them, developing the whole, just as in some well-planned illumination, a dark and shapeless building will run into a blaze of light at the touch of a single torch.

We propose then, at present, to close our observations with an analysis of the Phædrus, considered not only as the first specimen of Plato's system of instruction, but as evidently intended by him to form a preface and introduction to the rest, and to give a general intimation of the principles on which all his works are constructed. Previous to this we must ask attention to a few more general observations, without which we shall be ill prepared for a more detailed inquiry.

In the first place, in selecting the Phædrus as the point from which the reader of Plato may commence, and so work his way to the Republic, it must not be forgotten that there is another course, in which we begin with the Republic, and end with the Phædrus. It is the peculiarity of all analytical reasoning, that it admits of this double process, like reptiles that can advance with their tails just as well as with their heads. In synthetical reasoning, as for instance in Aristotle, we commence with a certainty, and follow on to a certainty. In analytical, we commence with a doubt, and so try our way to a certainty. In the one case we go by a known road from a place, which we know to be York, to London, which we never yet saw; in the other, we get upon a coach at York, and go off on a journey to discover by the places to which we arrive at last, whether the place from which we started was York or Dublin. In the one case we know we are on a continent, and journey on steadily and quietly till we choose to stop. In the other, we want to know whether we are in an island or not, and we strike out in all directions till we meet the sea in every part. Analytical reasoning, therefore, necessarily presumes a return to the principles from which we started, and which were in fact assumed merely as hypotheses and questions. If they are true, it is felt they will lead to such and such results, and if the results follow, the premises are held to be true.

It is evident, also, that when the journey has once been made, we may easily return upon our steps by ourselves, and make it a second time, with far more leisure to examine the scenery, and note down the direction-posts. Whereas the first time that we issue out on speculation, we shall require some guide to assist us, or be compelled at every step to ask where we are going. In synthetical reasoning this is not necessary, and the whole process may be performed alone. Without stopping to do more than suggest the important difference thus established between the two plans of teaching, with respect to the encouragement of a docile and trustful, or of a presumptuous rationalistic spirit—effects very strongly marked on the two schools of Plato and Aristotle—it may now be seen why there are wholly different modes of reading Plato, according as we are provided with an external clue to his meaning, or not. A young man who takes up Plato, without the slightest conception of the general scope and plan of his works, and without assistance from without, must begin with his dogmatic works. Tenneman proposes the Republic, and he is perfectly right, only it must be accompanied by the Laws, the

Timæus, and the Critias. He will then see clearly the general principles which are to be developed gradually in the preparatory dialogues, and they will serve, not indeed as a perfect clue, but as a guiding point, like a distant spire in the difficulties of a steeple-chase. He will be able to watch, in those dialogues, their development with interest, and to join his own exertions in unravelling the plot of an argument, when he knows something of the coming catastrophe. But even with such assistance, the task will be difficult, and often tedious; and requires far more attention and power of mind than can be commonly expected. The most obvious mode of facilitating the study of Plato, is, therefore, to supply the student, from an external quarter, with a general outline of the principles intended to be established; to tell him, in fact, where he is going, and then accompany him in the journeys, commencing with the Phædrus and the other sceptical dialogues, and gradually bringing him to the clear and expansive prospect which opens in the Republic. In this way his mind will be placed in the position contemplated throughout by Plato himself. He will work out truth in a great degree by his own energies, evolve right conclusions from the mixed truth and falsehood of his own original notions, and borrow only so much aid from his teacher as is required to bring to light the original conceptions of his nature.* To do this thoroughly, we require, first, a clear intelligible outline of the Platonic philosophy, which every young man may understand; then distinct introductions to each of the dialogues, pointing out the course of the reasonings, and fixing attention on the thousand minute delicacies and incidental hints which give shape and animation to the whole. Something of this kind, but we confess very briefly and imperfectly, has been attempted by most commentators. Cousin's are short headings, where the subject is treated in a bold, off-hand, sketchy French style, too pleasing to be very deep, or to create much confidence in the writer. Schleiermacher's are profoundly obscure; and not sufficiently detailed to initiate the student into the whole art and beautiful coherence of the several structures. And until some person thoroughly inspired with the soul of Plato, viewing things with his eyes, and devoting his whole mind to that one object, shall have examined the minutest point with the same confidence in their use and design with which an anatomist regards some new discovered fibre, or apparently superfluous vein—and has thus mastered and can explain the whole arrangement—we shall still encounter infinite perplexities, and the study of Plato will continue what it always hitherto has been, and what Plato himself mainly intended them to be, a mystery to exercise thought, and to elicit sparks of right feeling from the reader, rather than a channel for pouring into his mind a whole train of ready made speculations.

---

* Theætetus.

Far as we are at present from possessing, even in the profoundest critics of Germany, any such guide to his works, any resuscitated Socrates, we evidently enjoy more insight into their true nature than any former age of philosophy; and the reason is, that we are ourselves living in a period corresponding, most remarkably, with the times for which Plato wrote. We are beginning to feel his wants, to be perplexed with his difficulties, to witness the evils and enormities with which he was surrounded; and these are the best interpretations of the course which his thoughts took. They throw light upon the workings of his mind, as the facts foretold in a prophecy best explain the prophecy itself. And this is the clue which we propose to employ.

One,* therefore, of the best preparations which we should recommend to the student is, an accurate and thoughtful examination of a class of works very different from those of Plato in their outward form, but very similar in their aim and spirit, the comedies of Aristophanes, and especially the Clouds. Men smile when they hear the anecdote of one of the most venerable Fathers of the Church, who never went to bed without Aristophanes under his pillow. But the noble tone of morals, the elevated taste, the sound political wisdom, the boldness and acuteness of the satire, the grand object which is seen throughout of correcting the follies of the day, and improving the condition of his country, all these are features in Aristophanes, which, however disguised, as they intentionally are, by coarseness and buffoonery, entitle him to the highest respect from every reader of antiquity. He condescended, indeed, to play the part of jester to the Athenian tyrant. But his jests were the vehicles for telling to them the soundest truths. They were never without a far higher aim than to raise a momentary laugh. He was no farce writer, but a deep philosophical politician; grieved and ashamed at the condition of his country, and through the stage, the favourite amusement of Athenians, aiding to carry on the one great common work, which Plato proposed in his dialogues, and in which all the better and nobler spirits of the time seem to have concurred by a confederacy—the reformation of an atrocious democracy. There is as much system in the comedies of Aristophanes as in the dialogues of Plato. Every part of a vitiated public mind is exposed in its turn. Its demagogues in the Knights, its courts of justice in the

---

* On looking back, since this was written, to Mr. Mitchell's Preface to the Clouds of Aristophanes, we have been struck with the similarity of his views in many points; and the value of his very eloquent sketches in illustrating the times of Aristophanes. But we must beg leave to protest against his criticism on Socrates and Plato.

Wasps, its foreign policy in the Acharnians, its tyranny over the allies in the Birds, the state of female society in the Lysistrate and Ecclesiazusæ, and its corrupt taste in the Frogs. No one play is without its definite object: and the state of national education, as the greatest cause of all, is laid open in the Clouds. Whatever light is thrown, by that admirable play, upon the character of Socrates, and the position which he occupies in the Platonic Dialogues—a point, we may remark, on which the greatest mistakes are daily made—it is chiefly valuable as exhibiting, in a short but very complete analysis, and by a number of very fine Rembrand-like strokes, not ony of which must be overlooked, all the features of that frightful school of sophistry, which at that time was engaged systematically in corrupting the Athenian youths, and against which the whole battery of Plato was pointedly directed.

The existence of such a school is no longer, in this age, a matter of history. It is rising up again among ourselves, and though it has not yet attained its full deformity, unless we are warned in time, no wise man will venture to say to what lengths it may finally proceed.

It originated, like all other corruptions of human reason, in two distinct sources. It had two parents, one an error of the head, and the other a perversion of the heart. Neither of these by itself will ever propagate a very extensive mischief; for dry speculations will not spread without some passion to inflame them; and passion by itself, unless apparently countenanced by reason, will appear too gross to be imitated or avowed. It is the same in our daily vices; and an evil wish never takes its start till it is propped on some sophistical excuse.

It is to be observed also, that in the formation of all such schools, the error and the vice (vice, that is, in the language of the world) generally exist in distinct parties. The leaders are often moral men. The followers only are thoroughly depraved. Of Protagoras, for instance, Plato always speaks with some degree of respect; Epicurus was by no means a profligate; Hobbes was a man of decent regularity of life; Locke was never accused of any of those crimes to which his theories led in the French revolution; Paley, with one exception, does not seem to have been palpably corrupted by his miserable doctrines of expediency; and we never heard that either Bentham or Bowring had fallen into the hands of the police. The fact is well worth attention. It may guard us against tolerating errors, because they are not yet ripened into crimes. And it is a proof of the homage paid to virtue, that the absence of glaring vice is necessary for all exercise of authority.

The head of this sophistical monster was thus formed of minds cool, penetrating, and commanding, provided with a fair array of various accomplishments, and aided by a persuasive eloquence. The intellectual error raised as the standard of the party, was *the uncertainty of knowledge.* But it branched out into a multitude of others, which may easily be anticipated; and far from being primary itself, it was a consequence of a whole train of falsehoods, lying hid in a disordered imagination. Its conclusions are easily deduced. And we have only to take up a newspaper, or look over a debate in parliament, to find abundant illustration of the practical logic which forced this metaphysical principle through all the veins and channels of Athenian life, private or public. The argument ran thus: if there is no certainty in the individual, there is to him no truth,—if no truth, no falsehood,—if neither truth nor falsehood, neither also is there right or wrong, which are but intellectual perceptions of agreement or disagreement with some fixed standard of law. Therefore there is no law external to our own feelings. Our own feelings imperatively bid us pursue pleasure and avoid pain. Pleasure and pain, therefore, are the only rule of moral action, and the criterion of goodness.

It was here that the deep current of abstract thought burst out at once into day in a most marvellously intelligible form. It was like some apt musician passing from the dead dull labyrinths of scientific discords to an old familiar strain; and no sooner was it caught by all the unclean beasts of human kind, that lay battening in a stupid sensuality, than, to use the illustration of Plato, they pricked up their ears,* flourished their tails, and pranced off, over land and sea, after the metaphysical Orpheus, until he led them to the darling abode of intellect and vice, the democracy of Athens.

Never was a field so well prepared for the reception of such a crew. On the one hand, a rising generation, full of genius, passion, and imagination—in their infancy brought up in a harem amidst women with no pretensions to the dignity of wives or mothers†—in their boyhood managed by slaves, and left destitute of any instruction but a little music, a little grammar, and the exercises of the gymnasium‡—and in their youth let loose into the forum to listen to the profligate lessons of the demagogues of the day, and to have all truth and conscience obliterated amidst the whirl of a daily revolution. Living, as we do at this day, with security for the permanence of moral principles in the permanence of the Church, and amidst at least the forms of old established laws, we can scarcely realize to ourselves the frightful vortex of things and opinions which surrounded the young men of Athens. The council ruled by the will of a mob, the assembly swayed by every breath of passion, as the revengeful or the ludicrous prevailed—its orators boldly casting off every restraint upon human will, and not a voice that dared to wrestle with the popular frenzy, except by appealing to their interest—the courts of justice loosed from all the restrictions of statutes, and banishing or pardoning, fining, and poisoning, at the whim of the moment—no private property safe for a day from the extortions of the public—sycophants and informers on all sides ready to seize on the most innocent, unless bribed to give them a respite—the favourite of the day becoming the exile of to-morrow—men rising suddenly from the dregs of the people to the lordship of the Athenian empire—generals sent out to protect allies, returning all at once enriched with their plunder—whole cities swept away by the hand of public executioners, or removed bodily from place to place;—now a war to devastate their borders, and brought into their very homes by the jealousy and hostility of their slaves—then a pestilence bursting from heaven on all alike, and confounding all sentiment of religion, by its indiscriminate destruction—then a political convulsion, ejecting a whole class of the population, or ripe with assassination and massacre, and pillage; and in the midst of this frightful tumult, sufficient to bewilder and confound the strongest mind, no voice from laws, or teachers, or parents, or priests, to speak of a test of truth or rule of conscience, or order of nature on which their heart might rest, and find something like a shelter from the whirlwind.* Even religion aided the corruption, and scarcely a crime could be named which did not find its sanction in the theology of Hesiod or Homer.†

---

* Protagoras.

† See the Lysistrate and Eccles. passim; and compare them with the account given by Dr. Clarke of the interior of a Turkish seraglio.

‡ Alcibiades, 1, Theages, Amatores.

" Think," says Plato, in a long and noble passage in the 6th book of the Republic, p. 219,—" Think of the many causes of destruction that now await even those few gifted minds which nature so rarely produces. Think not of sophists by profession, who are said to corrupt and deprave them, but of a people of sophists—a whole nation gathering themselves together in assemblies, and courts, and theatres, and camps, and there clamouring out their censure or their applause till the very walls and the rocks re-echo. Think what, in such a tumult of wild and senseless tongues, young men must feel, and ask if any discipline, any lessons of his home can resist the outcry, and save him from being deluged with the uproar and swept away headlong down the torrent. Look at the dealing of the people with those who refuse to follow them. They confiscate, they disgrace, they put to death—and how can any reasoning resist these fearful influences? Be assured," he adds again and again, "there is not, and never has been, and never will be in the midst of such an education *a mind that can be raised to virtue—except it be more*

---

* Repub. b. 6.

† Laws, p. 360.

than human. Be assured, that if a single soul in the present constitution of our states be saved, and become what it should be, it must be by a miracle from God. They hear the public voice speaking the same language with the sophists, preaching the same doctrines, calling the same things wisdom: just as if a man had a monster that he fed, and had learned its temper and its lusts, and how he might approach it safely, how stroke it down, what would tame and what would make it furious, the sounds which it is used to utter, and those which will soothe or exasperate it; and having learned all this by living with the beast and studying its habits, he should call it wisdom, and form it into an art, and proceed to teach it—knowing nothing of these notions or these lusts, which are noble and which are mean—which good and which evil—which just and which unjust, but naming every thing after the fancies of the monster brute; what it liked calling good, and what it disliked, evil. Then turn," he proceeds, "to the very advantages which nature may have given to a high minded, favoured young man—talent and courage and taste, and strength and fortune. Will not even these cause his ruin, when he sees the whole empire of Greece placed within his grasp, even the barbarians exposed to him—and his heart swells and his fancy is puffed up, and when those who love him best would admonish him of the care of his soul; others, who scorn such a thought, spur him on in the race of ambition, and strain every nerve to drag him from the influence which would save him from destruction."

This is but a wretched abridgment of a passage which, more than any other, lays open the real state of Plato's mind. It is in the original, full of the most noble eloquence, the eloquence of deep simple indignant melancholy, at the spectacle of vice and ruin which lay before him in his degraded country. And it should be studied again and again, to show that the thing uppermost in his thoughts, was the condition of the young men of Athens, and a last desperate struggle to save, if it were possible, a few.

One part of the quotation has anticipated a remark of no little importance in explaining the influence which the sophist possessed over the minds of the young. Ignorant and uninstructed as they were, they were yet placed within reach of the most tempting prizes which could stimulate covetousness or ambition. The place of popular orator was open to all, and the popular orator of a democracy is for the time its lord and master. To become a Pericles, a Cleon or an Alcibiades, with the mob of Athens and the treasury of its allies at their command, and all the dreams of power, which Athens cherished capable of realization for the aggrandisement of its leaders, was within the reach of every citizen. One thing only was wanting—Oratory. There were no books, which speak to men in their more sober and thoughtful hours; no fixed laws to supersede new daily appeals to the popular will; no prescriptive authority of rank, or natural reverence for virtue; things which in other constitutions render eloquence superfluous, or counteract its mischief. Without oratory no influence could be obtained.

In this state of things the sophists made their appearance. Gorgias, with his wordy, florid, pantological tautologies, to take captive an Athenian House of Lords; Protagoras, with his political economy, and expediency morals; Hippias,* loaded with an encyclopedia of physical science and useful knowledge; Prodicus, the Horne Tooke of Greece, with an etymological hair-splitting power of purism, at which the careless colloquialist of Athens looked on with wonder; together with Polus, and a host of other strangers who form the back-ground of the singular groupe which is sketched in the beginning of the Protagoras. The whole stage decoration of that dialogue is worthy of great attention. Socrates is wakened in the morning before it is light, by a young friend, who finds his way into his bed-room in breathless haste, to announce the happy news that Protagoras is arrived at Athens. They proceed both to the house of Callias, a sort of Athenian Holland House, where the sophists in great numbers are supposed to be lodged. On being admitted with some difficulty, after a parley with a surley porter, wearied out with the succession of visitors to the newly arrived prodigies—

"We found," says Socrates, "Protagoras walking in the vestibule. Walking with him in a line on one side were Callias and his brother, and Charmides—all of them men of the first rank: on the other Xanthippus, the son of Pericles, and Philippides and Antimænus, one of the most promising of Protagoras's disciples, and who intended to become a professor himself. Behind and listening to all that passed were a number of others, chiefly strangers, specimens of the herd who were mentioned before as charmed by this Orpheus of metaphysics, and following the sound of his voice from city to city. At the sight of this band of attendants, I was delighted," says Socrates, "to observe how carefully they avoided getting into the way of Protagoras. Whenever he turned and his party, the disciples fell back and divided themselves, wheeling off to the right and left in admirable order, and scrupulously arranging themselves behind him. After Protagoras I observed Hippias of Elis, sitting in the opposite vestibule on a sort of throne, and around him about the steps were sitting Eryximachus and Andion, and a number of others, who appeared to be putting questions to Hippias on astronomy and physical science; while he, sitting aloft on his throne, dispensed to them their several answers. Prodicus was also there in a little room which was formerly used as a butler's pantry, but now from the influx of guests, Callias had been obliged to empty it and turn it into a bedroom. He was lying there in bed wrapped in a quantity of sheep-skins and blankets. On sofas near sat Pausanias and Agathon, the two Adimantus', and some others. But what they were talking of I was unable to catch, notwithstanding all my anxiety to hear Prodicus—for he seems to me a man of universal knowledge, and more than human; but from the gruffness of his voice there was such a buzzing in the room that I could not distinguish what he said."

---

* We are afraid that Hippias would have put to shame the most encyclopedistic Penny Magazine sophists of the present day.

"Tell me," says Socrates to him, "is this not the case in every science. I ask you, as an universal knowledge man, as one who knows every art and every science, as I heard you boasting the other day in the market-place. You stated that you went to the Olympic games with every thing about you, the work of your own hand,—your ring cut by yourself, a seal engraved by yourself, a smelling bottle and oil-cruise made with your own hands. You had tanned your own shoes, woven your own shirts, spun your own cloak, and even your Persian girdle was your own embroidery. Besides this, you came loaded with poems, epic poems, and tragedies, and dithyrambics, and a whole catalogue of speeches and novels, all your own. You professed yourself also a thorough master of all other arts and professions, especially of rhythm and harmonics, and orthography; and many other things beside, as I well remember. I had nearly forgotten your art of memory, the most brilliant of all your accomplishments." —*Hippias*, 324.

We trust that such a prodigy of well-bestowed intellect and labour will stimulate this still sluggish age, and that even now we may live to see the woolsack occupied by a chancellor, further advanced in the pursuit of useful knowledge than any who have yet preceded him, who shall sit there not only as the maker of his own law, but the mender of his own stockings, and curler of his own wig.

Then follows his introduction to Protagoras, and an account from Protagoras himself of the profession and character of a Sophist.

No little mistake has been caused by giving to this word itself a wrong etymological signification. It neither means, as Dr. Bowring supposes, who, knowing nothing of Greek, has pronounced Aristotle and Plato to be fools—the wisest of men—still less what is denoted by the term in English, artful and illogical reasoners. The sophists were the persons who professed *to make others wise;* they were the great instructors, the London University, the Useful Knowledge Club, the National Education Society of Athens. Undoubtedly the office they assumed implied their own personal wisdom; and the necessity of maintaining appearances without any real stock of knowledge, coupled with the principle of pleasing without any regard to truth, seduced them into those habits of ingenious trickery, which have since been known by their name. But as Protagoras himself states, it was as the original introducers of a wholly new scheme of education that they took their stand, made their money, and incurred, in no few instances, the odium of political innovators. In this light they were regarded by Plato.

Nothing could be more tempting than the condition of the youth of Athens, for clever conceited, ambitious men, by their own theory disencumbered of a conscience, and obliged by a sense of duty to provide for their own indulgences, to undertake the task of fitting them for those public duties of life, which in a Grecian democracy occupied the whole field of action. And rhetoric, as the main engine of political eminence, they were thoroughly capable of teaching. The habit of disputation, which sent Hippias every year* to the Olympic games to challenge a run upon his pantological budget, and to improvise on all possible questions, just as scholasticism in the middle ages sent scholars up and down Europe to post their themes and syllogisms at the gates of universities, had given them a thorough command, not over language alone, but over all the arts of concealing ignorance, and misleading weakness, which were necessary to a popular demagogue. Language as the instrument of power over minds—language as the imperfect medium of communicating ideas, and, therefore, the readiest means of mixing and embezzling them in the transfer—language as the art of pleasing—language as the never-failing subject for etymological ingenuity to anatomize—language, again, as the natural transcript of the human mind, and the human mind in that low vulgar form, in which alone a popular leader or an expediency-philosopher can see it, or wish to see it—language in all these lights was to the sophists every thing. It was their stock in trade—the nostrum they offered for sale, the ready unblushing witness to all their paradoxes; the forms through which these moral magnetisers manipulated their somnolent victims; the gaudy tinsel stage which was to attract to the raree show within, the hand-bill of the mountebank, and the apparatus for his thimble-rig. Hence the prominence given in so many of Plato's dialogues to the subject of language,—and especially the invariable connexion between the practical abuse of rhetoric and metaphysical discussions on the nature of pleasure and of truth. This also is the key to the Cratylus—a dialogue which, by the most singular misconception, has been searched by Greek critics for etymologies, but which is a serious extravaganza to expose the Horne-Tookism of the day, and its connexion with the metaphysics of sophistry.

The advantages held out to the teachers of this new art of politics were not few. Courted, admired, and pampered by the rich; stared at, at an awful distance, by the poor; their levees thronged with daily votaries; their names wafted from city to city;—crowds gathering round them in all places of public resort, to witness their skill in disputation, and applaud the triumph; the day filled up with the excitement of the contest, or the enjoyment of victory, and business suspended during their presence, as in England at the announcement of a sparring-match or cock-fight†—they yet reaped still more solid advantages from these labours in the diffusion of useful knowledge.

Unlike the great philosophers of ancient Greece, the modern sophists did not disdain to receive a compensation for their labours. They were anxious to disseminate learning, and to found for it an itinerant college, but like their modern successors, they still had an eye to the dividends. "Think," says Hippias to Socrates,* "of the sums of money which Protagoras and Prodicus collected from Greece. If you knew how much I had made myself, you would well be surprised. From one town, and that a very small one, I carried off more than 150 minæ, which I took home, and gave to my father, to the extreme astonishment of himself and my townsmen. In fact I think that I have cleared as a sophist more than any two others put together."

---

* Hippias.

† Apply Clouds, the Two *Logics*.

To this solid advantage was added no little political consideration in their respective cities. Nearly all the most eminent sophists are found as ambassadors at Athens, and in that capacity they took the opportunity of delivering their lectures. The influence also which they exerted on the people was a fresh source of power and profit. And still other opportunities there were of indulging baser passions than ambition, on which it is impossible to dwell. They lie before us indeed in hideous deformity in every page of Grecian history. But we must cover them up and pass on; only, painful as the task is, bearing them in mind, when we would understand the frightful struggle in which Plato was engaged, and no more joining in the clamour against his noble and pure mind, than we would charge with the crime of murder the finder and helper of a murdered man, because he had blood upon his clothes.

Such were some of the circumstances under which the new system of national education was introduced into Athens. The consequences were such as might be expected. Take away truth from the mind of man, and external law from his conscience, and abandom him in the midst of temptation, and encouraged by the only persons he respects, to the opinion and passion of the hour, and we know what follows. Give then by a natural constitution extraordinary activity to his intellect, and violence to his passions, and you make a monster. And the picture drawn in the Clouds of the metamorphosis effected by a Sophist in the character of a young, high-spirited, thoughtless Athenian, falls very little short of one. Instead of music, gymnastics, field-sports and religious ceremonies, his time was now occupied in captious quibbling, bad metaphysics, or bombastic rhetoric. His open-heartedness was changed into cunning—his simple affectionate feeling hardened into entire abandonment even of filial duty, and not rarely into parricide. Human nature was degraded to a level with the brute, and a system of morals founded on the analogy of their instincts. His unreflecting reverence for the gods was laid aside for atheism, or* a theology which made the Divine Being himself susceptible of bribery, or an accomplice in his crimes. His obedience to the laws of his country was cast to the winds; and his country looked on only as a prize for the most crafty plotters, and society as a state of war,† in which might was the only rule of right, and to become a tyrant the supreme happiness of man. The simple unsophisticated instincts of right and wrong were obliterated in the coarsest shamelessness. The very language of morals was confounded, till honesty was called folly, and goodnature weakness, and cunning wisdom, and he was thought wisest and best who could impose most cleverly on others, whether by word or deed, by falsehood or assassination, by solemn promises, or still more solemn perjuries.‡ Even the boon which nature showered so profusely on the Greek races, personal beauty and strength, was lost in the general ruin; and instead of the open walk, the manly figure, and countenance flushed with health and ingenuous modesty, the eye fell on every side upon paleness, emaciation, and effeminacy and deformity, betraying the wreck of the mind within.

---

* Hippias Major, p. 78.

Those who are familiar with the comedies of Athens, its orators and its historians, will not accuse this sketch of any exaggeration. It is not a picture of what might follow, but of what had followed in the time of Plato. And upon this spectacle he was looking when he wrote his Dialogues. And let us pause for one moment to reflect on the feelings with which he must have regarded it. We will not indeed elevate the character of Plato to a level with that of Pythagoras, so far as existing records enable us to judge. He had not the boldness or decision of character to organize an extensive confederacy, and thus obtain the command of the political movements of his country. There is a want of energy about his measures—a reasoning, didactic, speculative tone of mind which would fit him for writing in the closet far better than for acting in the assembly. His indignation, strong as it is, permits him still the use of irony, and irony rarely coexists with the highest intensity of feeling. He seems to play and dally with human nature, as a timid physician trifles with palliatives, instead of crushing it in the full blossom of its sins with a hand of iron. Even the elaborate polish of his words, the art with which every stone is fitted into its proper place, indicate a thoughtfulness and design, and a thoughtfulness slightly diverted from a practical object to a speculative production, which is scarcely consistent with the vehemence of a bold energetic reformer.§

---

* Laws, x. † See the theory well drawn out in the preface to Hobbe's de Cive.

‡ Thucydides, lib. 5.

§ Plato lived till 80 years of age, and according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, he

They are not like the passionate outbursts—the rapid, vivid sparks showered off by a gigantic hand welding, blow upon blow, a red-hot mass of human corruption. If Luther, instead of popular tracts, rough, coarse, but full of fire, which kindled the populace in a moment, and engaged even the printers in a conspiracy to publish them with scrupulous accuracy, while they filled the answers of the Romanists with the absurdest blunders; if he had sat down in his closet, and left Platonic dialogues as a legacy to the world, or like Erasmus had written praises of folly, the Papacy, as far as he was concerned, would have been in vigour to this day. It is passion, and not intellect, which effects revolutions. And the most perfectly finished works of literature tell least at a time of excitement. They keep the light burning for future generations, but do not diffuse it at the moment.

When we add to this natural bias of Plato's mind, the catastrophe of the Pythagorean schools, the murder of Socrates, the jealous passions of the Athenian tyrant, and perhaps the hopelessness of the case, we may be prepared for that, which undoubtedly occurs in his writings, more of a lamenting melancholy tone, more of sarcasm, contempt, and remonstrance, than of that intense indignation and energy which we might expect from the purity of his heart. And yet his feeling cannot be mistaken. Read the sixth book of the Republic, the end of the Convivium, the Alcibiades, the Lysis, the beginning of the Theætetus, and especially the whole of the Phædrus, and every line is full of the deepest compassion and sympathy. Not a dialogue but young men are introduced as the persons to be taught, or corrected, or encouraged. Education is the first thought throughout, and the sophist, their deadly enemy, to be expelled from his rule over their hearts. From Socrates, lying at noon-day under the plane tree on the banks of the Ilyssus, and raising up the thoughts of the corrupted Phædrus to another world above him, to the same Socrates sitting in the dungeon, with his hand playing with the hair of Phædo before he entered on that world himself, it is still the friend and guide and moral father of the young, not a mere eloquent poet or speculative philosopher, that is foremost in the pictures of Plato.

And let us learn the feelings with which he regarded them from himself, and not from others. Neither bad-hearted nor cold-hearted men can understand the depth and holiness and

---

was engaged to the very last moment in "*combing and curling, and weaving and unweaving his writings after a variety of fashions.*" Κτενίζων καὶ βοστρυχίζων καὶ πάντα τρόπον αναπλέκων. After his death there was found a tablet, in which the few first words of the Republic were varied and arranged in a number of forms. κατέβην χθὲς ἐις Πειραῖα μετὰ Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος. Dionys. Halicar. Περὶ Συνθες. 25. p. 242. The same anecdote is related by Quintilian, Demetrius Phalereus, and Diogenes Laertius.

power of that affection which God himself inspires in the best of hearts, for young souls placed within their reach to be reared up in goodness and truth. Their weakness and tenderness and blindness to the peril that surround them—their warmth of feeling unchilled as yet by the cold hand of a selfish world—the trustfulness with which they surrender themselves to the guidance of others who know themselves to be fallible and frail—their unsuspecting earnestness, their energy and spirit, their open candour and joyousness of heart, hopes which we sigh to think are vain, and fears at whose simplicity we smile---these and many, many lineaments of a nature originally divine, not yet worn out by sin, but bearing still upon them faint gleams of a light from heaven, which fade and die away too often as they descend into the world; even that which nature intended to be the symbol of the soul within, the eye full of openness and joy, the brow unfurrowed with care, the cheek still alive to shame, the frame erect in manliness and vigorous for the duties of life — all these are not placed before us by Him who formed our heart, as things to be looked on with apathy and coldness, or suffered to be crushed and trodden on as we trample on the flower of the field. Give to such beings moreover great powers of good or evil—wealth, talent or rank, on which the fate of thousands may depend, and their own souls go down to the grave, covered, according to their deeds, with the blessings or curses of mankind; and a young man becomes to any thoughtful mind not merely an object of interest, but a spectacle of awe. Not merely the length of one life, but the eternity of many souls, is involved in the acts of his earliest days; and there is One engaging him in a game of which he knows and can know nothing with this frightful stake depending upon its issue. But add to this the thought (we use the language of Plato, not language borrowed from Christianity), that all which is beautiful in nature came from God, and is a type of God, and was seen by him at the beginning to be good, and was showered in profusion upon earth that it might rejoice our hearts, and bind us to his works and to each other, and lead up our affections through the shades and imagery of a glorious creation to a still higher world above us, and to Him who is its Maker and King. Remember that men are not as stocks and stones, but living souls bound to each other by one common origin, engaged in one common struggle to rise up from the dungeon of this life, and the slavery of passion, into a pure and holy region, where they may see God face to face—that in this race they are companions of angels—when they fall, falling together, and when they rise, rising together—that they bring into this world together spirits written over with the truths and hieroglyphics of a nobler state of being, and pass from it to retain beyond the grave the affections and communion cherished here. Think how affections at our birth are wrapped up in the inmost recesses of our nature, not to be stifled and killed, but to be called out, and expanded and consecrated each on its proper object*—that minds and not matter are those objects—that these affections are the springs to all noble actions, the cement of social life, the sweetener of our sorrows, the heightener of our joys, the restorer of energy, and hope even to the dying spirit—that no man ever lived as a saint who was not full of the sympathies of his nature, nor died as a hero without some one, either friend, or home, or country,† for whom to shed his blood. Think of our affections, in one word, as the very "wings of the soul."‡ raising us up from this dull, dead earth to Him whose name is Love. Then ask by what arm and power we have been saved ourselves from ruin, and raised to heaven, and how we can requite it but by going back and saving others from ruin likewise?§ Remember that here upon earth, and in the heart of man, God has his image; and wherever that image is, there is an object for our love;|| and wherever there is a human soul, there also is a being which we may form and fashion after the model of our God, and become to it its spiritual parent in all holiness, modesty and virtue.¶ And lastly, when a yearning rises up for an existence longer than this short space, even for immortality—remember that one way only is left to obtain it upon earth; if others can be left behind us to whom we have given life, new forms be prepared to take the place of those which must soon decay, and an eternal inheritance of virtue be thus propagated from soul to soul.** Bear all this in mind, and then we should say to a young man, you may approach in innocency and elevation of heart, even to those seeming mysteries of Plato, the oft-recurring questions of human affection, which, (mixed up as they are in concession, as he himself declares,†† to the necessities of the age,) with much to make us tremble, are nevertheless in substance holiness and purity itself. We know how holiest things in holiest places, even in God's own word, have been profaned by man's impurity. Let us not commit the same sin on the memory of the wisest of heathens; or wantonly defile a spring from which the best of men have drank goodness, health and strength, and lifted up their heads for a battle with their passions, and a triumph.

And these thoughts, so like what Christianity consecrates by blending them with the most solemn of its mysteries, and the consummation of its perfection, were in Plato not mere metaphysics. They formed a necessary part of his practical system. All philosophies whatever may be divided into two heads, those which contemplate things and those which establish relations with persons. This is the leading distinction. And Platonism, like all other sound and noble theories, was in a peculiar degree a philosophy of persons. The heart occupied its natural place in the structure of humanity. Feelings and affections were encouraged as well as ideas arranged. A spiritual world on all sides was seen behind the veil of a material world, and to this the affections passed on and there rested in their natural objects. To have left out the theory of the affections, or not given it a most prominent place, would have belied the whole character of Plato's mind. It was necessary for many other reasons. If men's hearts were to be raised and purified, and tuned to higher energies, this could only be effected by appealing to the common sympathies of their nature. Cold, lifeless reason, could do nothing. If the corrupting influence of the sophistical school was to be met and overcome, it was necessary to rouse up an antagonist power in good and pure emotions, to take affections which nature has firmly rooted in the best of minds, and train them to right objects instead of permitting them to run wild, or endeavouring to extirpate them wholly. There is a beautiful sermon of Dr. Chalmers' on this important law of moral education. If the evil spirit is to be driven out, do not leave its old abode empty and garnished for a time, but fill it at once with a good spirit, ready to keep and defend it. And this was never forgotten by Plato.

---

* Phædrus. † Laws. ‡ Phædrus. § Republic.
|| Phædrus. ¶ Republic ** Convivium. †† Phædrus.

Once more, as an educational system, his philosophy could no more move without the spring of affectionate feeling, than a locomotive engine, with all its wheels and boilers, can start if you put out the fire. Let not men suppose, as they do suppose in the present day, that you can educate by steam; that acts of parliament, and joint stock companies, and meetings at Exeter Hall, and Commissions of inquiry, and mechanics' institutes, and Lancastrian schools, and doses of useful knowledge, diluted to the meanest capacities, and patchwork of Scripture stitched together, that the child may not know whence it comes; that all this bustle of cosmopolitan dreamers and political mountebanks can train up a single child in the way in which he should go. There must be affection, strong, natural, unconscious affection—and affection as He intended—the *one* all-comprehending Being, who has appointed for us each, in his wisdom, but *one* Father, *one* friend, *one* wife, *one* master, bound us to *one* country, sanctioned but *one* king, permitted to us but *one* Church—as he himself has taught us, affection, concentrated in *one* object. Draw up before a child, or a young man, the whole portentous array of an educational police, teachers and subteachers, commissioners and committees, Houses of Parliament and Convocations of Preachers, and the child will turn away in terror, and run to hide itself in the bosom of its mother; and the young man will laugh in his sleeve, and go off to consult a companion no wiser than himself, if what they have told him is true. There is no certain access to the head except through the heart; and no access to the heart except through the authority of individuals. Even the Church cannot make herself visible, or secure her right place upon men's minds except in the person of her ministers. And as nature has given to the young, affections which thus look up and fix themselves on some one personification of an excellence superior to their own, so she has also provided for them, from their earliest years, a number of such objects around them; and accident or rather Providence for the most part, rarely a predetermined arrangement on the part of man, decides the particular point to which they are carried and adhere. You cannot arrange men, least of all young men, and drill them into processional order, and bind them together as friends, by a will of your own. Affection is spontaneous, and defies compulsion, and takes fright at interference. So that all which an extensive system of corporate education can do, is to remove out of the way all wrong objects, supply as many good as possible, leave the heart to its own natural play, and wait the result. And such were Plato's views. His great fundamental scheme piercing through every subject and fully developed in his Republic, is a polity for the education of man, just as the Church is a polity, so far as mere human nature is concerned, constructed for the education of Christians.* It was to have laws, superintendents and teachers. But Plato no more thought of practically working his system and conveying his lessons to the heart, through his central committee of phylaces, or any subordinate functionaries, than he would have proposed to teach loyalty to a nation by garrisoning their towns, or honesty to the thieves of London by an establishment of police. He secured stability by such a plan in the maxims of education. He gave support and authority to individual influence. He regulated movements, and removed obstacles, and insured a supply of virtue, but the particular channels through which that supply was to flow, he left to the instincts of nature, and accidental combinations of society. He left it, as we must leave it, with all our parade of machinery, to the voluntary zeal, or the unintentional infection of individuals—to that moral influence of example and personal attachment, which can neither be forced by acts of parliament, nor ensured by endowments, nor remunerated by salaries, but without which the whole system of education, however orderly and beautifully branched out by its contriver, is but a dead tree, and will bear no fruit. We know how this spirit is engendered and fostered by Christianity. The very facts of Christianity supply it. But Plato had no such facts. He wished that every old man in the state might look on every young man as his child,* but to obtain the groundwork for this feeling he was obliged to imagine (imagine only, for he never proposed to realize) a state of things which might give to all a community of interest and life, such as the Church literally fulfils in the spiritual world. He felt, as Christianity feels, the difficulty of the problem—how with man's tendency and duty absorbed in the contemplation of perfection;* his eye may be forced downward and his affections engaged in an inferior object. And he used the same arguments with Christianity, that such a task is a duty devolved on us by the will of the great Legislator of the world; that the society which reared us from our infancy demands this requital at our hand;* that we are to look to the good of the whole, and not allow selfish enjoyment to interfere with the general interests. But Plato knew how little such reasonings would tell, without some feeling to carry them to the heart. And therefore, like Christianity itself, he permitted particular attachments and indulged and encouraged that universal instinct of paternal affection which, in the words of Clement,† makes all who teach as fathers, and all who are taught as children; and never allows a good man a single superiority over others, without compelling him to use it as means of raising them to a level with himself, and finding his highest enjoyment in the accomplishing the perfection of others. It was this spirit that actuated himself.

---

* Repub. 5, 7.

"He that speaketh to others through his writings," says Clement, in another passage, (p. 273,) "is bound as by a solemn oath to God, and registers this vow—not to write for lucre, not for vain glory, not to be vanquished by prejudice, not to be enslaved by fears, not to be elated by pleasure; to think of but one enjoyment, the salvation of those that read. And not even this to think of sharing at the present, but to wait patiently in hope for his reward, from him that hath promised to pay his labourers according to their hire."

We have been led on this point much farther than we had intended. But it is not a digression. It is absolutely necessary in a preparation for understanding the main features of Plato's philosophy, and especially for approaching the Phædrus, with which the study of the system must commence. The analysis which we had proposed to give of that singular dialogue, must be postponed till another time. For there are a few more preliminary remarks which it will be expedient to make, before we conclude for the present.

---

* Repub. † Stromat. lib. 1.

In the first place, returning to the statement which was made respecting the fundamental doctrine of the sophist and its logical conclusions, we may now understand the principle on which Plato arranged his plan of attack. For instance, as the conclusion must follow, if the premise be granted, he never attempted to stem the torrent of mischief anywhere but at its source. Every question of vice and virtue, politics or morals, pleasure or pain, is carried up by him at once to the original ground of dispute, the *certainty of knowledge.* It is treated, and treated most properly, as a question of science, never of mere feeling, still less of expediency. If there is a doubt as to the right or the wrong of an action, we must look for some standard of right. At the very least the discovery of such a standard must be an intellectual process. If none can be obtained, our moral principles are gone. If any can be obtained, we have only to observe it. This accounts also for the perpetual recurrence of the doctrine of ideas (*ὁ θρυλλοῦμεν,* Phæd.), on which his standard of morals was founded. It accounts also for the unsparing severity with which he cut away from the human mind every thing like fancy, poetry, mere emotion, casual opinions, sensation, and the like. These formed the empire of his adversaries. And until he could take his footing on a sure ground of truth, he was wholly unable to combat with them. Hence it is that the nature of human knowledge, of science and opinion, occupy so large a portion of every work, not as an abstract metaphysical question, but as constituting in fact the very root of the sophistical doctrine, which he was endeavouring to eradicate. His end was not like the German theorists, speculation, but practice. His practice involved his speculation.

This accounts also for the comparative gentleness with which, as we observed before, he deals with the greatest delinquencies, and for which he throws out an early apology in the Phædrus. (p. 60.)

When men can trace faults to errors, and excuse absurdity or vice as ignorance of truth, it is astonishing how their indignation subsides. Want of skill in dialectics is the source to which Plato refers for all the follies and sins of the day. It seems at first sight folly and sin to assign any such misnomer. And Aristotle, and other moralists, who have either purposely perverted, or have misconceived the theory of Plato, make themselves very merry with the thought of thus turning crimes into mistakes. A little consideration would prevent all such thoughtless criticism; and opportunities may occur hereafter of pointing out the real relation in which, according to the view of Plato, and to the facts of human nature, the head must stand to the heart. At present this forgiving spirit is mentioned as an explanation of the studious adaptation of his writings to an undeveloped or perverted, or careless condition of the intellect, of the minuteness with which he draws out every link in a chain of reasoning, the effort to awaken and retain the attention, the little indulgences of humorous and dramatic action, at times the florid and gorgeous description, all addressed, as he distinctly says in the Phædrus, to Phædrus himself, that is, to the class of readers of which Phædrus was the type—the gifted, profligate, and corrupted youth of Athens.

Still this was not all that was required for the extirpation of the sophistical school. Their fundamental doctrine of the uncertainty of knowledge, branched out, indeed, into these corruptions; but it had also its roots—roots very deeply sunk; and it was very little to lop the boughs, and leave the stock alive, to send forth a fresh succession. To cut this stock out of the ground was the main design of Plato, and perhaps no effort of the human intellect is more astonishing than this to a thoughtful mind, not frivolously ridiculing things which he does not understand, but penetrating into the real thoughts of Plato, and alive to the difficulties of his position.

The origin of the sceptical theory, traced historically, is to be found in physical science; and the origin of physical science is to be found in a stage of society when the principle of faith is abandoned for that of self-will, and men are released from the sense of a moral influence above them, embodied in human authority. It was so in the Ionian school of old, and it was so in the Baconian philosophy. Thales paved the way for Heraclitus and Pyrrho, Bacon for Hobbes and Locke, and the Sophists of the present day. And the course of human reason has ran through similar channels, and fallen down the same succession of degradations in the Heathen and the Christian era.

There are but two objects on which men can exercise their reason, mind and matter, or to use a distinction made before, "*persons and things*." So long as we fix our eyes upon minds, or persons, or spiritual agents within and without us, so long our moral affections come naturally into play, and the moral relations of life will be maintained and obeyed. There will be no question of a law without us, for we shall recognize it in the very existence of every moral agent. For no moral agent can exist without prescribing limits to the actions of others, deserving affections, and reciprocating duties, without therefore being to us *a law*. There will be no question of a law within us, a law of conscience, because the act of self-reflection will exhibit our twofold nature, reason and goodness on the one hand, passion and vice on the other, and the two cannot be placed side by side, without our at once recognizing where lies the imperative authority. The natural superiority of virtue over vice, when virtue and vice are both before us, is as much a necessary perception, as that four are more than two. When it is not perceived we may be sure the comparison is not made. When we are accustomed thus to believe in and to act up to relations with other moral beings within our own experience, we shall be very docile, even very credulous when we are told by them of other moral beings out of sight. Religion will become part of our nature. It will be only an expansion towards God of feelings already existing towards man. Upon this moral vision, joined to the consciousness of our own infirmities, and our instinctive conception of something better than ourselves, we shall build our faith in man, and upon our faith in man we shall rest our belief in God. On this follows our belief of a future state—of rewards and punishments;—of moral responsibility; and all the other views which give definiteness to our choice of actions, and by practically influencing our conduct, do more than all the reason in the world to harden and anneal our fancies and opinions into enduring subjective realities. Fancy paints pictures on the mind, but it is action that burns them in, and hope and fear, pleasure and pain, that kindle the fire.

In this way, wherever there is an abiding sense of spiritual and moral agents surrounding and acting upon us, there we shall find no place for moral scepticism, no ingenious cavillings about the distinctions of right and wrong; and where there is no scepticism in morals, there will be none in any thing else. You may prove to a good man, that the whole of the material creation is, according to Heraclitus, in a perpetual flux. It no more affects him than thedecay of a house interests the lodger for the day; it is no part of himself. You may throw doubts upon every sense; but they are quite faithful enough to support life, and it is not with the eye or the ear that he becomes acquainted with moral realities. You may exhibit vacillations and discrepancies in the sentiments of the world; but the world is not the standard to which he appeals; he is quite beyond the reach of any such vicissitudes and convulsions. If he is weak himself, he has strength elsewhere; and as the very notion of a Deity is necessarily that of perfection, his strength cannot be impaired. Nothing can shake him, which does not shake God. From Plato to Descartes, from St. Paul to the humblest Christian, it is still but one simple act of faith. There is a God; God is goodness; goodness will take care of me.* And the ground, the only ground for this belief, and all its consequences, is to be found in an instinctive, a Christian will say a supernatural, power of vision, by which spiritual beings are brought under the eye of our consciences, hidden, as they may be, behind a veil of flesh, or wholly removed from sense. Sight and obedience, obedience and certainty follow together, the moment a Power above, whether by the instinct of a warm, affectionate, trustful, heart, or by the quickening of a dead nature within us, bids us, as Eneas was bade,—

---

* Timæus, Repub., Phæd.

> "Adspice, namque omnem, quæ nunc obducta tuenti
> Mortales hebetat visus tibi, et humida circum
> Caligat, nubem eripiam: tu ne qua parentis,
> Jussa time, neu præceptis parere recusa."

And then follows the vision of Deity,—

> "Apparent diræ facies, inimicaque Trojæ,
> Numina magna Deûm."—(*Virgil.* lib. 2.)

Now then, reverse the case. Close up this spiritual eye, and thicken the darkness laid upon it, even in its natural state, by a course of vice or frivolity, or the absence of reflection, or conceit, or self-will, or self-indulgence, or contempt for others, or any other passion or folly by which man is shut up into himself, as in a dungeon; and if his reason is to be employed at all, it will turn naturally, at first, upon the material world. He loses sight of mind, and becomes wholly conversant with matter. The material world, we know as a fact, is but a series of changes. If by an experimental philosophy, such as the present day delights in, we reduce its movements to general laws, and so give it unity, fixedness and eternity, and therefore a semblance of power, we shall undoubtedly run the risk of making it our God. It will possess the main qualities required by the cravings of *human reason* to satisfy its contemplation; and in the case of which we are speaking, the heart has no place, and reason is every thing. Thus Aristotle's physical science led him as naturally to the eternity of the world, and something approximating to Pantheism, as the same science before our eyes is encouraging the same absurdities, though while the Church maintains her ground, they dare not openly appear. But remove experimental philosophy, as was the case in the Ionian school, and leave men nothing but the perpetual changes before them of outward objects, their fallible senses to watch those changes, and very imperfect metaphysics to explain their physical experiences, with about as much propriety as the price of a chaldron of coals is taken to measure the cost of a ton of hay; put man in this position, and nothing on earth can save him from the most frightful scepticism. There is nothing uniform without—no order, no law; nothing stable within—for the nobler spirit of his nature has never been heard speaking with the stern voice of unalterable uncompromising duty. Testimony is suspected because it varies. Human opinions are full of doubt, for virtue alone is one, and vice many. And men, in the eyes of such a sceptic, are nothing but vicious machines, swayed about by every impact of sense. Religion, of course, there is none; for there is nothing from which to infer it,—no order of nature, where nature is a heap of disorder; no voice of conscience, where a moral being within is unfelt; no authority of tradition, where all testimony is full of suspicion; no moral influence of example, where moral agents are unknown. What is true of physical knowledge and religion, applies equally to morals. And thus the whole of nature is unsettled, and the fabric of man and of society falls in one chaos to the ground.

Such is the connection between the doctrine of Heraclitus, asserting the perpetual flux of matter, and the demoralization of the Sophistical school. And we may be well alarmed at the example, when every day physical science is rising into undue pre-eminence, and withdrawing men's eyes from that moral world which alone can fix our duties and realize our perfection.

It is very true, that at present it is not taking precisely the same line of mischief in which the Ionian school terminated. The uniformity of nature, which has been proved by experimental philosophy, rather engenders dogmatism than doubt at first; but ultimately the result will be the same. This very uniformity, so wonderful, so attractive, and so full of power, will absorb men's minds, and withdraw them from holding communion with the moral world. In this way they will lose sight of the moral world, and, with the moral world, of the only stable ground of positive certainty. For after all, experience is not like intuition. The bond which holds together the series of material changes, is not like the indissoluble union of our moral sentiments: experience may fracture the one, but it cannot touch the other. We can believe that the sun, which rises in the east to-day, may, by an altered law, rise in the west to-morrow; but we cannot believe that goodness will be hateful, or vice be rewarded, or virtue be indifferent to a virtuous being, or disobedience to superior wisdom become a duty, at any time, in any place, under any convulsion of nature. The whole universe of the physical creation may be overturned without any destruction to our real being. Rivers may run backward to their sources, fire descend downward to the earth, the courses of the stars be reversed, the poison of to-day become the food of to-morrow, the very elemental law of all outward things be repealed, and instead of all things following as they have been, what once has been may never be again; but even in this vast ruin, moral truths would still remain unaltered and unalterable, on which a good and holy mind would rest as on a rock,—

> "Si fractus illabatur orbis
> Impavidum ferient ruinæ."

But if man has no such rock, even without such a physical convulsion there is much to shake his belief. There is the *possibility* of changes; the suspicion, and more than suspicion, the common belief of man of disturbances in the order of nature: there is the ignorance of the individual; the multitude of apparent anomalies; the succession of rival theories, rising and falling upon each other, like the sand hills in an hour-glass And after all we know but little, very little, of the physical world; and our conviction of its immutability is an exercise of faith, not the forced result of experience. We believe that all things will continue in order, because He that made all things is good. Any other reason is, indeed, vain. Remove, therefore, the sense of an overruling Being, by thinking too much of his works; lose sight of the Creator in the creature, and this ground of certainty goes likewise. But then think of that which must come sooner or later, the "*crux ultima*" of human belief—the weary mind, the aching heart, the sick solitude, the bed of death, those hours when men can no more drown themselves in the intoxication of experiments, —cannot pick roots, or sort flints, or anatomize beetles,—when though the whole physical world were thrown open to us, not all its mysteries together could fill up one corner of a desolated heart, nor all its treasures purchase one drop of cold water for the burning of the tongue; and in those hours, if nothing is left to animate and quiet, but the uniformity of matter, what is to become of man? He may go through life as a piece of machinery, conforming himself to the machinery of nature, and consolidating himself into it as a part, and when he triumphs by succumbing to its laws and cleaves through the water without winds, and flies into the air, though nature has chained him to the ground, and is swept along by a little vapour over raised up mountains of rubbish, and through dark holes fathoms underground; he may stand in the pride of his heart, by the black, panting, steaming, monster which drags him along, and rejoice that, after all, he himself is the *great locomotive* of the world, and that the order of nature is nothing but a tram-road for him to work on. And all this will do very well till the engine blows up, or breaks down, or till he reaches to the end of his journey, cold, comfortless, and solitary—with a night, and a dark night, before him. It will be happy, very happy, for such a man, if nothing worse than a sense of desolation follows upon such an absorption of thought; if even then, when those still in their strength would cheer him by the miracles of art, he only turns, like a weary child, worn out with the wonders of a play, and cries himself to sleep upon the breast of his mother. But if his mother is not there to receive him, the case is, indeed, hopeless, and utter despondency must follow. In one word, let us not suppose that the passion for physical science is at all less likely now than hitherto to end in a moral scepticism. The end will be one step removed, but that is all. We may think that we have moored our belief to the side of an island, but the moment the fire is lighted we shall find that, like Sinbad, we have cast anchor on the back of a whale.

Many other symptoms might be collected to show, that as a nation we are rapidly losing that power of moral vision, without which a nation perishes. The sophistical doctrine, that every man is the measure of all things, that the feeling of the moment, under the name of conscience, is the only standard of right and wrong; that a numerical majority of voices is not indeed the test of truth, for truth is supposed to be beyond the reach of man, but the guide to be followed both in morals and religion; that the fancy of each individual, as to possible expediency, is to be the rule of political conduct, instead of old written laws, and still older inherited maxims; these, and many other like things, are fatal indications of an approaching plague. In both the great divisions of erring Christianity, the sophistical doctrine is fully developed. In Dissent, indeed, it is openly avowed; in Romanism openly repudiated and secretly followed. In both there is the same departure from external law and Catholic antiquity; only in Dissent every individual is a sophist; in Romanism the whole society collectively in the person of its heads. In like manner our views of education are veering round to the same point with the notions of Hippias and Protagoras. We hear much of a variety of accomplishments, indiscriminately accumulated, and ostentatiously displayed. The same problems regarding education meet us now, as in the days of Plato. Whether it is education or instruction, a discipline for the whole man, or a pouring in of facts into the sieve of his memory; whether it is to be conducted on the old maxims of our forefathers, or new modelled by some Sophist of the day; whether it must be connected with religion, or torn from it; whether truth be a necessary ingredient in it, or practical knowledge only be required; that is, so much knowledge as may serve to fill a man's pocket in the world, as the rhetoric of Gorgias enabled the young Athenian to become the pampered demagogue of Athens. If oral instruction is diminishing, so it was at Athens; if books are multiplying upon us, and books of the most frivolous kind, so it was at Athens; if a shifting and changing of opinion has destroyed all confidence in public men, so it was at Athens; if the infection has been spread from abroad, and smuggled in, like other diseases, through the wares of Germany and France, so it was at Athens. Their sophists were also foreigners. And if their young men were the first to catch the plague, we may well look to ours. Of those who are safe under the protection and guidance of the Church, it is happily unnecessary to speak; but there is a class elsewhere, and a very numerous and important class, the medical students of the metropolis, who, we fear, would little bear a scrutiny into their condition; and, there is reason to believe, are at this moment falling a prey to one of the worst forms of sophistry, under a recognized teacher of Materialism. We hear much of the slavery of negroes, and the duty of converting the heathen; we trust some Christian mind will soon rouse the attention of the country to this most alarming point in the alarming condition of the metropolis.

It is a painful parallel, which renders the revival, at this moment, of the study of Plato a matter of no little interest to a philosophical observer. It indicates a sense of the evil, though perhaps not of its definite form. It promises subsidiary aid,—so much aid as sound philosophy can give to sound religion,—to the efforts of the Catholic Church, which only can save the country from the same ruin of its people and its liberties, its morals and religion, which befel the Athenians.

We shall conclude with briefly pointing out the means which Plato adopted to destroy the mischief at its roots; and they may not be uninstructive to ourselves in our present very similar condition. He began, then, with destroying the authority of the teachers of this new school. He knew that no doctrines can spread, unsupported by a personal influence; and the influence of ostentatious knowledge, and real powers of intellect, was only to be undermined in three ways,—by exposing the fallacy of their pretensions, and humbling them by ridicule; by exhibiting equal powers, and very similar accomplishments in his own works; and by attracting from them to himself the personal respect and attachment of the young.

Hence, in the first place, the irony, sarcasm, and elenctic character of all his preliminary dialogues, in which sophists are introduced and exposed, before the mind of the reader is transferred to the positive instructions of Plato himself. To give full scope to this design, as well as to embody his reasoning in a dialectical and dramatic form, it was necessary to adopt some character which should unite the powers of ridicule and grave teaching; and blend the comedy and tragedy of philosophy in that dramatic form so congenial to the Athenian taste. The same principle which led to the exhibition of living characters on the stage, pointed to Socrates as the man to represent this part. We know from the faithful, affectionate account of Xenophon, who seems to have written with a view to vindicate the character of his master from the travesties to which he was exposed, that mere human reason never rose to more pure, elevated, and practical morality, than in the ethics of Socrates. We may be sure, also, both from the Clouds, and from Plato, that there were about him many personal peculiarities, oddness of appearance, coarseness at times of illustration, and habits of life, which made him a very fitting subject for this ethical caricature; not a caricature intended to ridicule, but necessary for carrying on a plot, and just sufficiently heightened to excite a smile without destroying the resemblance. We know as a fact, that the Lysis, which was published before his death, contains things which by his own declaration he never said. The metaphysical arguments of Plato also are wholly unlike the plain practical ethics, on which the fame of Socrates had rested. Anachronisms, studiously introduced, prove that the dialogues themselves are not narratives of facts, but historical fictions; and the very name given to them by Aristotle, *Σωκρατικοὶ λόγοι*, as ranked with the poetry of the drama, proves that they were works of imagination,—creations, not repetitions. We are therefore not to look in the Socrates of Plato for the real living Socrates. He is rather a more serious personification of the Greek comedy, with its deep solemn truths within it, and a strange face of mockery without; or to use a common illustration, the model of moral beauty encased in a corporeal Silenus. It is remarkable, but in perfect consistency with the object assumed, that all his irony and jesting, the solemn dissimulation of his meaning, the grave, ingenious, ignis-fatuus-like trickery with which he plays on before a poor unsuspecting disputant, and draws him, step after step, into the middle of a quagmire, is reserved wholly for the Sophists. It never enters into a dialogue where young men are the immediate learners, or old men the inquirers after truth. He is always far from personal pretensions; more anxious to stimulate curiosity than to indulge the indolence of learning; but he never displays the slightest approach to a heartless sneering cavilling; nothing but honest unaffected endeavours to bring minds to the knowledge of truth. Nothing can be more grotesque than the writhings of the angry sophist, once entangled in the meshes of Socrate. Sometimes it ends in silence; sometimes in a humbled confession; not unfrequently in charges of unfairness, and no little violence of language.* But the effect is complete,—the sophist exposed, and the spell broken.

To the second object mentioned, that of raising a counteracting attraction to the brilliant shop-window of the sophist, we must attribute much of the poetical embellishment and elaborate finish of the Platonic writings. The so-often censured floridness of the Phædrus is avowedly employed for this purpose. The Menexenus, instead of being, as supposed, a grave panygeric on that Athenian democracy whom Plato never thought of without compassion for the people, and indignation and disgust at their leaders, is an exhibition of popular rhetoric, to show how easily he might excel in a style of rhetorical flattery which he expressly repudiates and disdains. All minute attention to language he censures, both in the Politician and the Laws; and yet the language of Plato is the very perfection of style. Consider this as a practical effort to win the attention of the young, and every thing is consistent; look on it merely as an exhibition of taste, and it is perfectly unintelligible. On the same principle the recurrence is to be explained of those gorgeous myths, which appear to have been imitated after a practice of Protagoras.*

---

* Republ. b. 1.

The foundation of the academy and the plan for perpetuating a school, both projects unknown before at Athens, are indications of the third mode mentioned by which he proposed to counteract the personal influence of the sophists.

His next object was to attack their theory in its vital point, and raise up some solid foundation for a structure of human knowledge, something to resist scepticism, a sort of hurricane house, against the whirl of sensation, opinion, and feeling. For this purpose, and not as a mere hypothetical speculation, he built up his doctrine of Ideas. We hope to enlarge on this more fully on some future occasion; it is sufficient at present to point out its three grand features.

In the first place it asserted the existence of certain fixed forms and shapes in the material world, laws which regulated its movement, types after which its combinations were formed, in opposition to that view of it which considered it as a jumble of atoms, a chaos of shapeless accidents. It gave what the Baconian philosophy gave, under precisely the same name of *forms*, system and order to the visible creation; and a system founded, whether rightly or not, at least in perfect agreement with almost every theory of physical science, on a scheme of classification. In establishing this system as something prior to and distinct from human conceptions, and as fixing limits which human sensation could not pass, it placed over even our sensations an external law, something which modified sense, but which sense could not modify, and which, therefore, is the basis for physical truth—a fixed standard, existing, even if not found, to which we must bring our conceptions of the physical world, and by which they may be tested.

He extended the same assertion to the moral world—declared that by the very constitution of the mind certain notions and feelings were so intimately associated together as to be wholly incapable of separation. For instance, the perception of truth, enjoyment of truth, and desire to attain it; in the same manner, the rightness of justice, its agreeableness to a law within us, its beauty, and a conviction of its expediency—in the same manner particular perceptions following unerringly and universally upon the placing before the mind certain objects in certain connection with each other, in other words, ideas of relation—these formed a second class of the *ideas* or *forms,* or groups and shapes of things, created by nature, stamped upon the soul indelibly, which man cannot break or dissolve, which are wholly beyond his power to change, which never do change, and which we cannot conceive it possible to change, which fix, therefore, an immutable standard and give a foundation and test for moral truth.

---

* Protagoras.

Still these were subjective certainties, that is, they were immutable combinations existing in the human mind; and even the eternal forms of the material world, in a certain sense, were subjective, inasmuch as the perception of external objects may be reduced wholly to states of mind, and therefore are ultimately subjective.

But subjective certainty, however strong and universal, does not satisfy the demand of men for necessary unalterable truth. Unless we believe in something above and beyond us, wholly unmoved by our fancies and independent of our sensations, we do not feel that we possess a sure and solid ground for belief. The mind must be anchored somewhere, and that somewhere must be a solid rock, not part of the ship itself. This rock and anchorage for the mind is to the Christian the whole spiritual world, revealed to his sight by Christianity. He never saw this world, has no proof of its existence, no proof that is, which, if he choose to cavil, he may not be able to dispute. We may dispute every thing. But he has been told that it exists, and he believes the tale, because it is *natural* that he *should* believe the statement of others; and his belief holds fast because nothing adequate occurs to make him distrust his informants; he believes upon their testimony. In the same manner Plato proposed to realize to the minds of his hearers an unseen world, a place higher than the dim sight of men, untouched by sublunary changes, prior to the creation of the visible world, in which men's thoughts were to be fixed, and where, when his perfection was accomplished, he was hereafter to dwell. The existence of some such world is a necessary anticipation of man's nature; it forms a part of every mythology and of the creed of the savage. It is not till we have penetrated far into the depths of metaphysics, and thrown such light upon the formation of our ideas, as to reduce all things else to total darkness, that man dreams of a subjective existence, and a subjective existence only, as true or possible.

But rationalism necessarily leads to this tendency to subjectiveness. It does so in the present day. Men who have lost their perception of other moral beings commanding their belief and engaging their thoughts and affections, if they do not throw themselves upon a world of matter, busy themselves in scrutinizing the nature of themselves. Hence so much of our literature which is not taken up with physical science is made up of a display of feelings, of confessions, and autobiographies, of descriptions of distempered minds, of anatomical preparations of sins and follies put into glass-cases and exhibited by the diseased parties themselves. Every man is thinking of himself; and so it was at Athens. But we have a ground to fall back upon in bringing men back from this miserable state of self-consciousness, which Plato had not. We have the Church; and her existence and her testimony fully and boldly put forward will restore men to their senses. It will rouse them from this moral somnambulism in which they are plunged at present, by the vivid action of an object external to themselves, against which they cannot close their eyes, or, when once seen, withdraw their senses. But Plato was compelled in the first place to go to reason. He could find little in the popular religion, which could be consecrated to such a purpose as the creation before the eye of the mind of an unseen and perfect world. All that he could do was to argue from the visible to the invisible, from the imperfect to the perfect. This world, he reasoned,* is the work of design;† design implies an end, and an end existing before the means by which it is accomplished. This end requires a form or model for the machinery which creates it; therefore, prior to the creation of the world there must have been types and patterns somewhere before the eye of the Creator, after which all things were formed, and up to which, as we find from experience, all our observations of nature lead, because we find its productions classified under certain heads, and reproducing unity of plan, in an infinite variety of shapes. Great, very great obscurity rests upon the objective character of those ideas or examples of the physical creation. But those who study him most, will, we think, recognize most clearly a picture undefined indeed, but brilliant and very real, of a sort of heaven—of locality and relations, and objective reality, which a Christian will not fail to compare with the more positive but not more distinct enunciations of the Scriptures.

But such a heaven, even the heaven of the Phædo, the treasure-house of all physical glories, is not enough to satisfy the heart. There must be also within it an Informing Spirit, by whom the heavens themselves were made, and in whose eternal immutable nature, anterior to all things and the cause of all things, the germ of the whole universe, spiritual and physical, lay hid before it pleased him to call it into existence,* who made it all for good, shaped it after types of good, impressed his character upon all, and therefore to whose character alone all goodness and all truth must be referred. And Him, the Maker of the world, the King of all flesh and of all spirits; who is to the world of spirits what the sun is to the world of sense, the ruler of its movements and cause of its life;† who gives truth to outward things and faith to the soul that perceives them; who is the source of all power, beauty of all beauties, truth of all truths, law of all laws, goodness of all goodness,—Plato, with that trembling awe with which all good and holy minds fall down in the presence of such a mystery, endeavoured to reveal to his corrupt and blinded age as the last and only hope of saving a few souls from the wreck. How he proposed to realize it to them is the last question to be answered. How does he accord or not with Christianity, on the fundamental problem of the mode in which truth is to be taught and engrafted on the mind of man, whether by authority or by rationalism? The answer is as follows.

---

* Timæus.

† Laws, B. 10.

That unhesitating, uncompromising grasp of principles, which Plato, as well as Christianity, declared to be necessary not only to human knowledge, but to human action,‡ he endeavoured to confirm in this point, as in others, by a dialectical process which tested every hypothesis advanced by its concordance with acknowledged truth, especially with the order of nature and the moral constitution of man. What faith is in Christianity, science, so far as science implies positive undoubting belief, is to Plato. They are both modes of obtaining absolute subjective certainty. But Plato was compelled to make this belief rest on demonstration; that is, on the seeming agreement of truth with itself; that seeming agreement depending on the constitution of each individual mind, and requiring a logical process wholly beyond the reach of all but the educated few. Christianity demands it as a duty, fixes it by repetition as a habit, demands it upon authority, not on demonstration, upon the testimony of many others, not on the testimony of our own single self; justifies the demand by the weight and vastness of the testimony produced; appeals to man's heart, before his head, and to those affections of the heart which are the soonest developed, and the last to be corrupted,—the trustfulness of a mind conscious of its own weakness, and docile under the guidance of superiors. It thus ensures its possession over the child from his infancy; never leaves him alone in a world of

* Timæus. † Republic, b. vi. ‡ Repub. passim.

doubt without some fixed habitual principles; makes his certainty independent of the perpetual fluctuation of daily opinions without, and of passing fancies and feelings within him; does not exclude demonstration, but never renders it necessary; obtains for him thus a hold over a whole world of truths, which are either beyond the reach of demonstration, or which demonstration could never bring home to his heart; and makes the very act a moral virtue, by requiring in it an exercise of principle which may be entirely wanting in the most perfect conviction of the reason. It gives to the child and the peasant, without any stipulation for those talents which are the rarest gifts of nature, knowledge, which the wisest of heathens vainly sought for; so that in the words even of a French philosopher,* " à la faveur des lumières qu'elle a communiquées au monde, le peuple même est plus instruit, et plus decidé sur un grand nombre de questions intéressantes que ne l'ont été les sectes des philosophes." And without waiting the slow and precarious process of raising the trees of truth from chance and thinly scattered seeds, it covers with them the whole field of human nature, and plants them at once full grown and full of blossom, to bring forth their fruit in due season.

This instrument for implanting knowledge in the human mind, was not within the reach of Plato. His belief was the belief of an individual, worked out to outward eyes by the energies of his own mind. There was no joint voice of an established society, no prejudice of early years, no habitual reverence of office, no connection with an organized system of testimony, preserved as one common deposit in the most remote regions, and transmitted as the inheritance of ages. He stood before those whom he would teach with no power of appealing except to their own reason. And he could recognize no certainty except where that reason approved.† And yet (it is one of the most important features in his system, and one which renders it so applicable to uphold truth in the present day), Plato does recognize the principle of faith wherever he can possibly employ it.

In the first place, on the subject of religion—

" Of the nature of the other deities," he says in the Timæus, " to speak or to describe their generation is beyond our power. We must believe those who have spoken to us of them from days of yore—children as they were, and as they called themselves, of the Gods, and knowing well their own forefathers. As children of the Gods we may not dare distrust them, even though the truths they tell us have no correspondences in experience, nor admit of a necessary demonstration. They tell us of things they know, and have heard and seen and felt, and we must obey the law and believe."‡

---

[*] Condorcet.

[†] Theætetus.

[‡] The word is still stronger in the Greek, and would suggest many solemn Christian thoughts, τὰ οικεια—things relating to their own home and family.

So also in the education of the young—

> "Supposing," he says in the Laws (B. 1) "that you have framed your statutes with even moderate prudence, one of the best and noblest of them all will be this—that you prohibit any young man whatever from inquiring curiously which laws are good and which are bad. And that you all, with one voice and mouth, unanimously proclaim that all alike are good, because the gods established them. If any one speak otherwise, close your ears and do not endure to listen. And if an old man be conscious of a defect in them, let all conversation upon it be confined to the magistrates and the old, and no young man be allowed to overhear it."

And again, in the Laws (B. 2), where he speaks of the departed taking an interest in the affairs of this life.

> "The statements which contain these doctrines are true but long. But on all such matters we must trust both to the traditions which relate to them, numerous as they are and of vast antiquity, and trust also to the framers of our laws, unless they teach what is wholly senseless."

In another passage of the Laws he says—

> "He that is to take his place amongst the perfectly blest and good, must be partaker of the truth from the very beginning of his life; that all that is possible of life may be spent in enjoyment of truth."

In other words, truths must be engrafted in the mind of the child long before he is able to understand them; and no dreary blank be left, no previous state of darkness before he is admitted to the light. His eyes are closed at his birth, and we are not to leave him in a dungeon, till he opens them and calls for light, but to pour the light gradually upon them, and couch them at the same time in order to admit it. It is the principle of infant baptism in heathen philosophy.

Such a process as this necessarily requires faith in the child, that he may submit himself to the hands of his instructor, and receive from him unexamined the doctrines which are afterwards to be unfolded. The same principles are indicated by the very form of instruction into which the Dialogues of Plato are cast, a form which is constructed on dialectical principles,* and those principles intimately connected with the very foundation of his system. The essential feature in the Platonic dialectics is the intervention of a second person,† to give birth to and shape and test the spontaneous creations of the mind. It might be very possible for a student in his closet to master and apply the whole logical system of Aristotle, using his formularies of argument, and carrying on whole processes of synthetical reasoning, as a child can play the game of patience by himself. But the analytical process of Plato, which insists on arriving at truth by over-

* Repub. b. 7.

† Theætetus.

throwing preliminary errors, and the principal object of which[*] is to bring men to a sense of their ignorance before it communicates knowledge; this can no more be carried on by ourselves than any other exercise, the value and interest of which consists in the possible defeat of the performer. It is a game of chess, and cannot be played single-handed.

A more direct enunciation of the principle is contained in the crowning part of the constitution of the Republic—a body of aged men, placed at the head of the state as the depositories of great truths,[†] and those truths the truths of religion. For whatever be the veil of metaphysics thrown over this part of Plato's writings, cautiously perhaps to avoid the jealousy of the Athenians, we must never forget that philosophy and religion were with Plato indissolubly connected. "Cujus scientiæ," says Lactantius, "summam breviter circumscribo, ut neque religio ulla sine sapientiâ suscipienda sit, nec ulla sine religione probanda sapientia."[‡] By them the education of the state is to be conducted; they are to discipline and form a perpetual succession of such teachers, by a long course of experimental instruction, and thus to transmit unimpaired their treasures of original truths, as the very palladium of the state. These are the "guardians and conservators of the society," and such a system could be maintained only by holding together all the parts of the state in a permanent and regular subordination through faith or unlimited confidence in the authority of the instructors.

Even in the personal character of Plato's thoughts, with all his necessary rationalism, there is a constant vein of trustful feeling running throughout—a willingness to receive truth for granted when coming from competent authority—a tendency to cast himself for support upon the guidance, testimony and control of others, looking to their moral superiority as the fit guarantee, rather than to the assent of his own individual reason. It is seen in his constant allusion to those old traditionary streams of ancient revelation, the *παλαιοὶ λόγοι* of his ancestors; in his fond and reverential returns to the mysteries[§] and myths of the East; in the stern and authoritative tone with which he supports the dictates of the laws of his country, whether Socrates[||] is commanded by them to die, or an hereditary mythology is enforced.[¶] If a ceremonial of religion is to be established, it is referred to the oracles of his ancestors. If the real ground is to be stated of his hope of immortality, as distinct from the possible arguments which reason might bring to their support, it is rested on the spontaneous belief, a belief of the heart rather than of the head, that God is good, and, as good, is a rewarder of goodness. But the noblest and most decisive passage is found in the tenth book of the Laws.

---

[*] Protagoras.

[†] Republic, b. 6.

[‡] Lactant. de Falsâ Religione, lib. 1.

[§] Phædo, Critias, Phædrus.

[||] Crit.

[¶] Laws.

> "How," says he, when about to enter on the argument of natural theology, (and we wish those who are giving weight to that theology to see where Plato laid the real foundation of belief)—"how without passion can we reason to prove the existence of God? It must be with bitterness of heart—with hatred and indignation against men, who compel us to engage in such an argument. They who once trusted to the tales, which from their childhood, when lying on the breast, they used to hear from their nurses and their mothers—tales told to soothe or awe them, and repeated like charms above their cradles—who heard them blended at the altar with prayers, and all the pomps and rituals so fair to the eye of a child;—while those same parents were offering up their sacrifices with all solemnity—earnestly and awfully praying for themselves and for their children, and with vows and supplications holding communion with God, as indeed a living God;—who when the sun and the moon arose, and passed again to their settings, heard of and witnessed all around them the kneeling and prostrate forms of Greeks and barbarians alike—all men in all their joys and all their sorrows, clinging as it were to God, not as an empty name, but as their all in all; and never suffering the fancy to intrude that God has no existence;—they who have despised all this—and without one justifying cause compel us now to reason as we do—how can such men expect, that with calm and gentle words we should be able to admonish and to teach them the existence of a God."

Such is the decision of Plato on the fundamental question in the education of man, the use and importance of authority; not that Aristotle would have answered otherwise,* or any other sect worthy of the name of philosophy. Even the Pyrrhonist recognised authority as the foundation of his unbelief, and by the common consent of mankind endeavour to prove that no such consent could be trusted.† In the same manner the still lower school of Sophistry, which made each man "the measure of all things," had, notwithstanding, its teachers and pupils, and held out its promises of instruction, with a demand of confidence in their wisdom. And in its most degraded and vitiated form of a Callicles‡ or a Thrasymachus,§ it only transferred the authority from a reason without to a passion within, and still gave up the individual as a slave to a power which impelled him blindly he knew not whither.

Undoubtedly, wherever we turn, this is the question, the question of authority, that meets us, and re-appears in every difficulty which embarrasses either the Church or the country. Every age has some one principle, or, to use a phrase very current in the new speculations of France, "represents an idea of its own," which it is the business of the philosophical observer to detect, and of those who are appointed to watch over the minds of men to regulate or expel; and this is the idea of the present day. Our legislation, year after year, is a series of concessions to the people, because no one but the people has a right to pronounce on their own interests or duties. The state is to be desecrated and unchristianized, because no human power may decide between contending opinions in religion. The polity of the Church is set aside, because man must not bend to man, but must be left in independence and solitude to judge of the mysteries of Heaven by the taper-light of his own reason alone, and to worship his Maker as he chooses. Our old schemes of education are to be remodelled to meet the wishes and opinions of those, to correct and control whose opinions all education is appointed. And when a new system is established, as in Ireland, for a whole nation to be won over to the truth, the same fatal *idea* rises up, and, as if by special contrivance, the very notion of authority is extinguished in the minds of the young, by bringing their teachers before them in direct and perpetual collision, on the most solemn of subjects; and by exhibiting in their daily tasks a conflict of difficulties and doubts,* which can end but in an alternative of evils—either absolute unbelief on the one hand, or absolute subjection, on the other, to the boldest assumer of a spiritual despotism. How is it that we have fallen into this gulf? How is it that we have forgotten not only the arguments of reason, but the very first instincts of our hearts, instincts that rise up before our face, at the very moment we attempt to belie them, and which we may misuse and calumniate, but cannot extinguish? We are unsettling the very foundation of Christianity by resting it on the useless support of an unsound natural theology—because we distrust the true basis on which it was placed by its Founder—the authority of its teachers. We are admitting into our philosophical schools, cold, feeble, undigested novelties, to engross and mislead the public mind, if the word *leading* can be applied to an influence, which only retards and embarrasses—because we are ashamed to acknowledge our adherence to the guides of antiquity. We are directing both public measures and private duties, measuring our politics and our ethics by the most false and fatal standard that human ingenuity ever devised, the standard of expediency; cutting off all reference to the past; denying the providence of Him who in making goodness the law of the world, made it also the preservation of the world; stifling our natural affections; annihilating the very essence of virtue; converting the whole of life into a business of calculation, and of calculation without data or end—simply because we are afraid of walking humbly by the precedents of our forefathers, of taking old lights to guide us in old ways, of trusting to the prejudices of nature, and boldly replying by her voice, as it is echoed by the whole of mankind, to those cavils of a curious casuistry—"why is this right, and this wrong?—why are we pleased, or why are we pained? as if it were not enough to say, that we approve and censure, and love and hate, and believe and obey, because nature has formed us thus; because such are our natural feelings, and we know they are true to nature, because no warning voice has risen from our fellows to condemn them—as if nothing was true which did not come within the range of our knowledge—nothing to be admitted as the witness of a power above ourselves—nothing believed until proved, instead of all things to be believed until disproved. And all this arises from one and the same source, our contempt or distrust of authority.

---

* Ethics, b. 1, c. 3.

† See Sect. Empir. passim.

‡ Gorgias.

§ Republic.

---

* See Scripture Lessons of the Irish Education Board.

Such was not the language of the old apologists when they were called on to defend Christianity, against the charge of a credulous faith. Even with far less advantages than ours—their persons despised, their polity not yet consolidated, their supernatural power denied, or paralleled with those of adversaries; with no support from the confession of the civilized world, or the tradition of eighteen centuries, they still met the charge face to face, and even in the midst of the most powerful appeals to reason, directed to the refutation of heathens, they upheld the principle of faith as applied to the education of Christians. "How," say they, "can a physician heal the sick, if the sick will not trust to his skill?"* "How can grammar, or geometry, or astronomy, or any other science or art, be taught, unless men, on the authority of their teachers, receive lessons which they do not understand?"† Who waits till he has examined opinions before he allies himself to a sect, or could even select his party, if he thus shrunk from committing himself to a teacher, in the fear lest his confidence should be abused? Such is the dictate of nature. All men, in the words of Cicero, "Ante tenentur astricti, quam quid esset optimum, judicare potuerunt. Deinde infirmissimo tempore ætatis, aut obsecuti amico cuidam, aut unâ alicujus quem primum audierunt oratione capti, de rebus incognitis judicant, et ad quamcumque sunt disciplinam quasi tempestate delati ad eam tanquam ad saxum adhærescunt."‡ And without such a happy law of attraction, to give order and stability to the world, society would be reduced into atoms; and those atoms left fluctuating about in a chaos of doubt and darkness; or rather sinking into stagnation, because in reasoning beings no part can move where none is at rest, and may serve as a resting-place to others. On this principle of faith depends the whole activity of life.

---

* Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. 1.

† Theodoret. Græc. Affec. Cur. lib. 1.

‡ Cicero. Acad. Quæs. lib. 2.

"Who," says Origen, "embarks upon a voyage, who marries a wife, who begets children, who cultivates the soil, except in the trust of good to come; though evil still may come, and often does come? And yet this hope and faith sends many courageously on deeds where none can tell the end; how much rather for a cause far other than a voyage, a marriage, or a harvest, shall we repose this faith in Him who endured such sufferings for us, and sent out his disciples upon earth, braving danger, and exile, and death, for the salvation of man."—*Origen, cont. Cels.* lib. i. c. 11.

We have now finished this rough sketch, not of the philosophy of Plato, for that would require a very different kind of discussion, but of the plan on which his philosophy seems to have formed itself, to meet the exigencies of his melancholy times. If any other can be framed, which serves more clearly to open the many acknowledged cyphers in his works, and give aim to their meaning, and order to their seeming confusion, this must be still more near to the truth. But no theory which leaves them as they are in the eyes of the world—an undigested mass of oratory and poetry, scepticism and dogmatism, irony and seriousness, more like the wreck and ruin of a noble mind, than a system organized and revised by him to the last moments of his life, can do justice to the intention, or can interpret the sentiments of him who, by common consent, is the "father and king of philosophy."

We have wished to show that his aim was practical, not idle speculation—that it was directed, in all its parts, against a most false and pernicious school, the natural product of the rationalistic licentious age in which he lived. If his system is to be revived now, let it be revived in this form, and directed against the same nuisance, and it may do the Church and the country infinite service. In this view we think, in England, men are beginning to feel, if not to understand it. And we shall not hesitate to assist, as much as lies in our power, in bringing it more fully to the light.

[illegible] Sewell

[illegible]

Art. II. — *Geraldine—a Tale of Conscience.* By E. C. A. In 2 vols. London: Booker and Dolman. 1837.

This is the work of a clever and observant person, though not practised in writing. It is a tale with little incident and no ending; or rather it is an attempt at a tale, which is left unravelled. But in truth its object is very different from that of putting out of hand a well-managed plot, being no other than to recommend the Roman Catholic religion to the favourable notice of the English Protestant; and accordingly it is made up principally of discussions on various points of faith and usage and sketches of character, such as are naturally suggested by the present state and peculiarities of religious parties. In these sketches we conceive the merit of the book lies, for the argumentative portion, as far as it is on the offensive, though not deficient in smartness, is not beyond the ability, and scarcely beyond the opinions, of any one who is not blinded by Ultra-Protestantism; and as far as it is a defence of Romanism, it fails strangely even in matters of fact. Similar failure attends its Roman Catholic sketches, which form an exception, as all readers will feel, to the general spirit and effectiveness of the author's style. It may be, that caricature is much easier than correct drawing, or that true excellence cannot be delineated by a few strokes, or brought out in its substance at the will of a writer; but, however we account for it, De Grey, Angela, Lady Winefride, and Mr. Bernard are but varieties of the "pius Æneas," with the same ambition in the writer, the same failure in the production.

The other characters, however, are for the most part amusingly drawn, and some of them, it must be confessed, good hits. There is a religious indifferentist, with a sufficient insight into the absurdities of the popular ways of thought, a hankering after Catholicity, and a kindness towards the imaginative parts of Romanism; a Whig lord enduring Protestantism and Romanism, yet attached to neither; a High-Church Oxford divine; a Reformation-Society Protestant; a pert young lady inclined to the Presbyterian persuasion; and a parish clergyman of the modern school, amiable, active, uxorious and absurd. Among these personages the heroine moves, being the only child of a widowed father, and heiress of his estates, who, after going through the phases of Protestantism, as it exists among us, seeks for something deeper and truer in Anglicanism, or, as Mr. Palmer more correctly speaks in his recent work, Anglo-Catholicism; is disappointed, and at length finds in the Church of Rome the refuge which she is in quest of.

Geraldine, a name which the reader may have already had sagacity enough to give her, is represented as driven from Protestantism by its endless janglings and changes; and from the Anglican Church by the inconsistency at present existing between its principles and practice. She has been originally brought to serious thoughts about religion by members of what is called the evangelical party; for a time she is in a state of great happiness, till she finds herself involved in the disputes and wanderings which it may be said to consist of, rather than to contain. She falls in with Romanists, and wishes to believe a creed which promises to give the peace and stability which she so much needs. In this state of mind she thus speaks to her intimate friend, the Presbyterian already mentioned.

"Kate! Kate! tell me not that every Bible reader knows the truth: I am weary of this repeated but unsatisfactory answer; I have proved its hollowness. You know well the increased interest I took in religion three years ago,—the confidence I placed in the body of professing Christians, both in this neighbourhood and in London, and the conspicuous part which, from my zeal and my position here, I was induced to take in the various religious associations set on foot. What has become of those Bible readers?—those I most trusted! One has ceased to pray, and now can only praise, being certain of salvation; another has joined the Baptists, being dissatisfied with 'infant baptism;' and my former excellent governess, and still dear friend, has become infatuated by the doctrines of the 'Miraculous Gifts;' and has even been worked upon, by the frenzy of excitement, to utter those sounds which her party denominate the 'Unknown Tongue!' She has ceased to communicate with any of her former acquaintances, as being without the pale of the true Church, which has received baptism by the Holy Ghost; but she still yearns after me with the feelings of a sister. I have received several letters from her, and what think you is her constant entreaty? That I will read the Bible, and nothing but the Bible! pointing out to me the chapter hitherto so neglected during centuries, and reserved for these latter days, to be brought to light by the perfected Church. You know the chapter, Katharine; it is the fourteenth of Corinthians, in which there is certainly most distinct mention made by the Apostle of those very gifts of the Spirit, which, like the power of healing, the Irvingites contend would never have been lost but through want of faith. Now, Katharine, I have looked far too deeply into the cause of all this wild, unstable conduct, longer to suppose it the fault of the individuals who have so wandered astray. It is the *system* which I see is wrong,—the system of private interpretation of Scripture; and hence, however I may pity, I can never blame its victims."—vol. i. pp. 9, 10.

Again; we have another amusing sketch of the source of her perplexities in the following passage.

"'I was referring to a clergyman of the Established Church,' replied Geraldine, 'whom I met in London during the last season; when having, in addition to Sir Eustace De Grey's defence of his Church, listened repeatedly to that of his aunt, Lady Winefride Blount, and become curious to hear more, I overheard this Rev. Mr. P——, in conversation one evening, at a serious party at Lady Lucy Foster's, make some comments, which I never forgot. 'The present state of the Protestant world,' said he, 'is one of curious contemplation to the philosopher, and one of deep anxiety and pain to the Christian. Infidelity stalks over the land, and will persecute where it dare. The Romish apostacy was superstition and idolatry; the Protestant apostacy is infidelity and anarchy. Each contains in its vital constitution the seeds of these corruptions and abuses. The Romish persecutions have been dreadful, but the infidel persecutions will be far worse; inasmuch as an idolater feels himself responsible to his false god, and the infidel is responsible to nothing. A God obscured is better than a God denied! . . . . The Roman Catholic Church is right respecting the power of miraculous gifts in the Church of Christ. There is a constant misapprehension respecting the *power* and the *exhibition* of miracles. If miracles were needless, except in the revelation of a new dispensation, why did they continue in the Jewish Church after it was firmly established? can it be supposed that God would bestow his gifts less on the Christian, than on the Jewish, Church? Miracles *are* granted to a faithful Church.' Much struck by these remarks, I requested to be introduced to this clergyman, to whom every one seemed to listen with as much attention as myself; and from that evening Mr. P—— became a frequent visitor in Berkeley Square. I had hitherto frequented the chapel in —— Street, where I had always been interested and instructed, and where Mr. P—— had himself occasionally officiated; but my new adviser now warned me against the dangerous doctrines that were gradually creeping in at M—— Chapel, without being able, however, to fix for me whither to go instead: 'For,' added he, 'the evangelical body is at present so infected with various heresies that I know not where you would be safe.' 'As a resident in Berkeley Square,' said I, 'my parish Church is St. George's; but all my religious friends assure me, that from the High Church party I should hear nothing that could improve me.' 'Very true,' replied Mr. P——, 'you would never hear the true Gospel from any of the preachers at the great west-end churches. However, do not let this state of things lead you into dissent; for much as I may warn you against the parties in the Church, I doubly warn you against the Dissenters. I have passed much of my life amongst them, and you may trust my experience, that their pride and arrogance are perfectly antichristian. 'No!' added he, 'the more intercourse I have held with the Dissenters, the less I have liked them:—keep clear of them!'

"'Ha!' cried the warden, suddenly roused from a reverie, 'a sensible man that:—who was he?'

"'The same man, my dear sir, who assured me, that I could never hear the true Gospel from the preachers of the High Church.'

"The warden was again silent and abstracted, and Geraldine continued. Mr. P—— then inquired whose ministry I attended when in the country? and on my speaking of my dead uncle Edmund,—of his piety, his zeal, his usefulness,—'Yes,' said he, 'Edmund Sinclair is a good man! we were friends at Cambridge—both at that time staunch Simeonites: but take care of his notions on 'Election,' for he has a considerable twist on that point.'

"'Positively, sir,' cried I, equally vexed and amused, 'as I am in such imminent danger from those of my own communion, I had better take refuge in the Catholic Church, where no difference of religious opinion is permitted.'

"'The Roman Catholic Church, you mean,' replied Mr. P——. 'No! you must not take so wild a step as that would be. You must not leave the pure worship of God for all those awful superstitions. The Romanists, however, have the right on their side in many things. They have indeed. But now,' added he, 'Farewell! for I must leave London within an hour:—Farewell! read your Bible, pray fervently, and rest satisfied that the 'assurance of faith in the believer,' is the highest perfection in the Christian course, and a foretaste of the time when Christ will be all in all.'"—vol. i. pp. 147—151.

Her father being at the time away, her maternal uncle, a Dr. Sinclair, warden of —— College, Oxford, has promised to stay with her at Elverton Hall during the long vacation; and to him she resolves to open her mind, with the hope of its being thereby settled in the faith of the Church in which she has been brought up. Such a procedure is in the particular case not only candid and sensible, but the evidence of a strong mind, for though the warden has many good qualities they are not exactly of the kind calculated to win over a young female. And here it may relieve the general reader to be told that the said warden is purely an imaginary being, a mere abstract head of a house; and we must do the author, or, as we suppose from internal evidence, the authoress the justice to say, that, while he is drawn with a good deal of cleverness, there is nothing ill-natured in the picture. He s represented as a person of learning and ability, High Church even to the imputation of Popery, a friend to Catholic Emancipation, and with expectancies from the Whigs. He is grave and dignified, really kind in his feelings and address, though somewhat condescending and pompous, and, when displeased, capable of a cold and stern or "college" manner, calm and ready in times of excitement, and gifted with an admirable command of temper.

He has got up his own system well, and knows exactly what answer to give on every occasion; how far to go with the Romanists and when to part with them. He is full of the praises of Hooker, Mede, Barrow, South, Taylor, Tillotson and others; hates Puritanism as the ruin of the Church; and, in spite of his real affection for his niece, has not a very exalted notion of the theological powers of young ladies. His one great defect is what may be called impenetrableness—an absence of all heart, play of mind, and elasticity of feeling;—in short he is not a person one would by choice take as one's confessor, which makes it the more creditable in Geraldine to consult him, and, we will add, the less likely withal beforehand that he would satisfy her. However, that is not her fault, but the author's; the sole alternative given her in the story lying in the warden's brother, an amiable excellent clergyman, to whom she is indebted for her first serious impressions, but deficient in the definiteness of principle, clearness of mind, and theological knowledge adapted to exercise a hold over a powerful understanding. She feels that, if she is to belong to the Church of England, it must be to the "old-fashioned Church," as she calls it, not to any modern edition of it; those who go so far as to advocate the doctrinal system of the new school in the Church, being bound in consistency to go on into dissent and liberalism, which are its legitimate results. To her uncle the warden, then, she betakes herself; and various conversations between them ensue, which end in the following most satisfactory and hopeful manner.

> " Geraldine here pressed her hand to her forehead, and remained some time silent:—at length she exclaimed, 'Then, uncle, I think I understand at last!—As the Church of England is, in essentials, exactly the same with the early Catholic Church of the first five centuries, inasmuch as that Church was infallible, because still pure from its apostolic founders, so also is the Church of England; but she cannot *enforce* any thing that is not proved to have been held by that early Church, and, of course, must not *deny* any thing, clearly flowing from that apostolic source.'
>
> " 'You are right, Geraldine.'
>
> " 'Well! uncle, I am satisfied; and I believe, shall be now, from this time, a very High Church woman, following strictly all the rules laid down for my practice in the 'Book of Common Prayer,' and endeavouring to recall all the wandering sheep of the flock into the one fold. My next interesting task will be the study of those pure ages in Church history, with which we claim kindred and communion: and in the meantime, I thank you, my dear kind uncle, for all your patience and trouble with me. But for you, I should have confounded our Church with the other Protestant communities; but for you, I should ere this have mistaken, as you have said, ' the reverse of wrong for right,' and have become a Roman Catholic!' "—vol. i. pp. 136, 137.

In consequence of the resolution contained in this extract, Geraldine commences the reading of Milner and Mosheim, and determines meanwhile to act up to the rules of the Church in which she finds herself. She makes a list of the fasts of the Church, and gives orders to the cook to serve up no meat upon them. She also tries to prevail on the neighbouring clergy to open their churches on week days, and to keep sacred the days of the Apostles and other saints, as prescribed. In neither project does she succeed; the fate of the former shall be set before the reader in the author's own words:

"'Blandford,' whispered the warden to his 'own man,' who stood at his post behind his master's chair at the dinner-table, 'inquire what the joint is, and where it is, and when it is to appear; I do not understand the plan of the dinner to-day.' A smile passed over the face of the butler, when summoned by the grave valet to reply to the provost's inquiry; but the sense of his own official position in approaching a brother dignitary, repressed in the head of the sideboard all undue sense of the ridiculous, as he informed the astonished doctor of divinity, that Miss Carrington had expressly ordered that no joint or meat of any kind should be served up on the '*Hamper* Days!'

"'Ah! what—really—oh! of course—very proper,' said the warden, with admirable presence of mind. 'Everard! a glass of wine.'

"'Willingly, warden. On the strength of the '*Hamper* Days?' Well!'

"'The *Ember* Days,' said Geraldine, much embarrassed by the sudden college look of her uncle, and the struggling mirth which played in the countenance of Mr. Everard and Miss Graham. 'The Ember Days begin on this, the twenty-first of September, and used always to be kept as days of abstinence in the Church of England.'

"'Why so? what was there either sinful or mournful about the Ember Days?' cried Katharine Graham, 'was it then St. Anthony preached to the fish, that we have nothing else at table?'

"'Come, come,' said Dr. Sinclair, rousing himself, 'there is plenty to eat, and a very good thing would it be, in a medical point of view, for the overfed portion of society to keep what the Anglo-Indians term a 'banyan day,' once or twice a-week. We all eat too much, according to Cornaro.'

"'Oh!' rejoined Miss Graham, 'I am sure that we can all do very well with less food, if necessary. I would often most willingly omit my dinner altogether, when I have taken no exercise. But it is the hope of propitiating God by fish and eggs, as holy food, that strikes me as so absurd. I would live on them entirely to do good to my fellow sinners; for instance, I would eat this insipid whiting every day, to ensure a good meat dinner to some poor exhausted creature; but for the salvation of my own soul! and to be, at the same time, seen of men! why, I can only quote—

'The devil must grin;
For his favourite sin
Is pride that apes humility.'

"The servants all tittered, and the colour rose painfully to Geraldine's cheeks, though, by a great effort, she preserved silence, and endeavoured to forgive—not Katharine, for from her she had never expected support, but her uncle, who had given her false encouragement by his theoretic adherence to what he shrunk from avowing practically. In his study, and amongst the fasting 'Fathers of the English Church,' Dr. Sinclair fasted retrospectively, and was at peace. Great then was his embarassment at being called upon to patronize the actual abstinence laid down so unmercifully in the Book of Common Prayer, and begun in all the simplicity of obedience by his niece; especially as he was aware of being too learned and noted a person in the Church not to have aroused enemies, who had already impeded his career of usefulness, by misrepresentations of the Popish twist of the learned warden of ——.

"'Geraldine,' said he at length, 'you remember, in the twentieth article of the Church, that 'she hath power to decree rites and ceremonies,' and therefore it may happen, that in her wisdom she may see fit to alter or abridge certain of them for the greater edification of its members. Now, although 'fasting' is warranted by the highest example and precept in Scripture, namely, that of Christ, and also of the Apostles, and therefore may be justly reckoned an article of Christian obligation, rather than a rite or ceremony, yet the appointment of certain days for the observance of this duty is a matter of Church discipline, which may be, and has been, altered at various times, all which I will explain to you at some future period. In the interim,' added he, 'I believe you need not make us keep any more of the 'Ember Days,' although I greatly applaud your zeal for desiring to act strictly according to the supposed commands of your Church.'

"Geraldine, pleased that her uncle had spoken on the subject, and had even praised her, readily gave up the Ember fast, in the full expectation that the alteration of the appointed days would be soon pointed out to her; and she now listened with recovered spirits to the learned conversation which took place throughout the rest of the repast, between the warden and Mr. Everard, on Jewish, Mahommedan, and Pagan fasts. Thence they went off to the Brahmins, till the departure of the servants, who, having at length placed the dessert on the table, finally left the room, completely mystified on the subject of fasting, and with but one clear persuasion, namely, that of the vast learning and power over 'dictionary words' possessed by the reverend warden and his friend."—vol. i. pp. 175—179.

This incident opened Geraldine's eyes to the fact that the warden's theology was properly speaking but a *literature*, that he knew what ought to be *said* on all occasions, but realized very little of the Anglican system in practice. And in consequence a suspicion not unnatural, however unfounded, arose in her mind concerning the reality of the said system itself, represented to her, as it was, in the person of such an advocate; a suspicion whether the distinctions and modifications and adjustments and balancings with which he handled the Protestant and Roman doctrines, were not after all but verbal, and had nothing solid, substantive, abiding, living beyond them. Certainly such a suspicion under such circumstances, it must be sorrowfully confessed, is pardonable; if, for instance, a Church prescribes days of fasting and abstinence, if it has singled out the Forty Days of Lent as such, and if grave persons observe a studied neglect of these, not merely not ostentatiously fasting, but actually giving dinners and holding festivities upon them, the question at first sight will come across a thoughtful person's mind, whether the whole system is not as shadowy as the particular specimens of it before his eyes, whether it is not a mere collection of arguments, serving as a refuge and excuse against either Romanism or Protestantism, rather than the positive theology of earnest and serious minds. So far then we do not blame but rather pity our heroine; we do not blame an enthusiastic and sanguine person experiencing a certain revulsion of feeling on her disappointment, and for the moment despising and shrinking from the system which had apparently deceived her. But we think that after the first feeling was over, good sense and sobriety ought to have resumed their sway, and to have whispered to her that the faults of others had no legitimate claim to determine her duties, or influence her conduct towards sacred things; that she had set out with a determination to act up to the Church's rules; that her Oxford uncle's not doing so did not excuse her; and that in a case far graver than that which was her present trial, it had been said, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that *observe and do;* but do *not ye after their works:* for they say *and do not.*" It will be observed that we are arguing with the author on his or her own ground; we do really admit that Oxford dignitaries neglect fasting in Lent or on Ember days; whether they do or not is nothing to the purpose, nothing to us. Geraldine and others like her should look to themselves before they look at heads of houses; even granting, for argument's sake, they did not fast, but gave dinners on fasting seasons, (which, we repeat, we grant in no other way,) they would not be acting so culpably in enjoying the good things of life, as young ladies in leaving the Church of England on account of it. Now since Geraldine did do so, and mainly because Dr. Sinclair, an individual head of a house, liked dinner in his dining-room, while upholding the duty of fasting in his library, and in spite of her confessing she ought to act up to such rules of her Church herself, and when there was nothing to hinder her, though others did not, we must say that the author has furnished a refutation to her own book, and an Anglican critic need do nothing besides putting together a few quotations from herself. The utmost she can fairly urge in the case she has imagined, is, that the neglect of duty on the part of authorities is a sort of *excuse* and palliation of a similar neglect on our part; but surely it does not *hinder* our personal performance of it. Indeed she has written very ill-advisedly for a Romanist; for, we suppose, she does not mean to say that in Roman monasteries there has never been neglect of the rules of the Church and of their order. The process of argument which led Geraldine to leave the English Church is the very one which led many an indignant reformer in the sixteenth century to a secession from the Roman; and we presume the author would not justify *that* procedure.

It is then an impatience, and nothing but a sinful impatience, to go out of the English Church for what every believing mind may find in it. The capabilities of our actual state, in the hands of any individual who is moved to use them, are so great, that, putting duty out of the question, it is great inconsiderateness to require more than is given us. Every one may either by faith or in fact develope and realize for himself what is given us in its elements. We have the high doctrines of the Sacraments, Apostolical Succession, Confession, Absolution, Penance, Fasts, Festivals, the daily Service, all recognized as existing ordinances; what do we want but the will to bring into existence what the Prayer Book contains—a will, which, if it exists in the individual himself, will enable him either at once or with a short delay to make all these exist, at least for his own comfort. If he must have an object of ambition, let it be to raise the tone of his own communion. Surely there is as much and as pure gratification in tending piously his afflicted and oppressed mother as in leaving her for another Church, which happens on her surface to have one or two Christian institutions more formally developed, as a set-off against the serious imputations which load her. The captivity in which the English Church lies, if it hinders her from moving, at least allows her children to move more freely. Rome, in some respects more free as a Church, is more free to shackle her children; is it better to have a sick mother or an unnatural one? to be illtreated by the Church itself, or left defenceless to the state? No; if Anglo-Catholics did but understand their position, it would be no despicable one. For ourselves, we find enough of satisfaction in it, not to be eager for any of those changes in the relation of Church to State which late political events and constitutional reforms make abstractedly fitting. What may be the duty of persons in high station in the Church is another matter; or what might be the Church's duty if her members one and all were of one mind and one judgment in all things, or what may be the duty of individuals as a matter of conscience in the event of certain contingencies; but at this moment, we conceive that Catholic truth will spread and flourish more satisfactorily under the existing state of things, than on any alteration which could be devised. We feel no desire for the meeting of Convocation; we are not even earnest in behalf of a repeal of the Statute of Præmunire, though it would certainly be becoming and just. We want changes of no kind, whether in the Prayer Book, or Articles, or Homilies, or Government, except any thing can be shown to us in our present state to be literally and directly sinful. We are content to take things as we have received them, and are quite sure that that system which was sufficient for the expansive minds of Andrews or Laud, has not been so circumscribed by subsequent political events, but it will hold us pigmies, however large we grow. We may like some parts of it less than others; we may conceive that some parts might be more primitive, other parts more finished; but we are thankful to have, and content to use, what has come down to us; and even where any thing has had an unsatisfactory origin, we will make the best of it, and receive it into, and assimilate it to the glorious deposit which we inherit from the Apostles.

What we have been observing of the ritual of religion applies to matters of doctrine also; and it may be worth while to enlarge upon it, though it will carry us some little way from our immediate subject. Geraldine grievously misunderstands her uncle's meaning on this head. He says, that the English Church appeals to the first five centuries; and she supposes this means that *anything* she finds an *instance* of in that period, by dipping into Mosheim or Milner, is our Church's law! But, surely, if he really represents the English Church, he does not mean that any one opinion which any one Father ever whispered or taught, is binding on our faith. If so, certainly our creed would be a worse bondage even than the Roman; for we should have to believe contradictories, and unsay one moment what we said the foregoing. Christianity has in it a great many questions which are but matters of opinion, of doubt, of surmise, in which one person may take one side, another another; which never have been and never can be determined. This is the true field for the religious exercise of private judgment; and for the duty of Christian forbearance and toleration, and this is closed up both by Protestants and Romanists. While Romanists are for settling every thing, Protestants deny there is any thing to settle; they strangely decide, for instance, not that a certain set of questions about the intermediate state *are* settled, which would be strange enough, but positively that they do not exist. They will not allow you even to ask the question about the condition, employments or the powers of departed Christians, ever so religiously, ever so historically, ever so little in the way of speculation, with ever so much deference to the opinions of holy men on the subject. They will not let you do what Augustine and Chrysostom did, and all on the plea that such a liberty has been before now abused; a mode of reasoning most contrary to the genius of the English Church, and if valid, inevitably stripping the Church Catholic of ordinances, ceremonies, usages and prayer-book, nay, used for that very purpose by Puritans and others. Moreover we may be quite sure that a far worse evil will arise from closing the door to these matters of opinion than permitting them. The human intellect needs some play, as it may be called, and Providence has mercifully consulted this peculiarity, whether we call it a weakness or not. He has given us an innocent outlet for its busy and restless activity. We might have been told peremptorily not to let our minds expatiate at all beyond what is positively revealed; but we are not so told; and the consequence of forbidding what God has not forbidden, will be like stopping a safety-valve. The mind, obstructed in its lawful avenues of thought, will be under the strong temptation to employ itself on subjects, where thought *is* precluded, the sacred and fundamental articles of faith. The irritation of the reason being denied its natural course, will strike inwards, and fall upon vital parts; not without guilt in those who yield to the temptation; but the responsibility of those who yield is one thing, and the responsibility of those who tempt another; and we are now speaking of a procedure which really acts indirectly as a temptation. We hold, then, that these secondary questions of religion are a sort of guarantee for the immunity of the primary points; further we hold that the consideration of them accustoms the mind to the notion of mysteries or secrets in religion, and thus positively protects and disposes towards the reception of the primary points; so that the suppression of the secondary is one of the main causes which tend to lead educated men among us into Sabellianism, Pelagianism, and kindred heresies. If we are determined to admit nothing but what is clear, while we cut off secondary questions, we shall undermine primary doctrines. Such is the mistake of Protestantism: on the other hand, it is easy to see that the contrary conduct of the Roman Church, of determining these doubtful points *in one certain way*, leads to the same evil by a different road. It makes a doubt about lesser points equivalent to a doubt about greater; and thus tempts the educated mind to snap the tie of faith altogether. Romanism tempts to infidelity, as Protestantism to Socinianism. Equally removed from both extremes, the English Church has set her children's feet, as it has been expressed, "in a large room." She has allowed ample space for diversity of minds, for varying judgments, tastes, feelings, and associations. And this is one reason why we think that Romanism will never spread in England, because whatever is good in it, whatever is adapted to the feelings of particular minds, all this we can enjoy in our Church without leaving her. It were hard indeed, if Puritanism might flourish in her, in spite of her Catholic formularies, yet that those truer elements which are concealed amid the additions of Popery, should not also be able to spring up under her salutary shadow. Mr. Everard's view of the matter is thus expressed in his conversation with Geraldine:—

> "Your duty appears to me to be plainly this, remain in that community of Christians where Providence has placed you; and never think of leaving it on account of its short comings, until you shall have acted up to all that it professes to enforce. This will be but justice to your Church, and proper respect to your uncle, who is deeply solicitous on your account. Believe me, that if you really thus act up to all that your Church inculcates, you will be so nearly a Catholic, that, excepting the points of union with Rome and the sacrament of extreme unction, you will be essentially a member of the Universal Church, and need contemplate no change."—vol. i. p. 161.

The last sentence is so strangely worded that it cannot of course be literally accepted by the Anglo-Catholic, but, *mutatis mutandis*, it is true. It is true that we of the English Church have Catholicism in its truest sense in our hands, if we have but the heart and the courage to use it; and the laity have but to ask the clergy for their rights, as laid down in the Prayer Book, and they must give them. In short, to return to Geraldine, that ardent young lady need not have turned Papist in order to keep fasts and feasts, or to reverence churches, or to recognize the mystery of the Eucharist, or to reverence celibacy, or to chant psalms, or to receive absolution, in a word to hold and practise the Creed of Cyprian or Augustine.

However, Geraldine is represented as finding out that the Anglican Creed is incompatible with that of the early Church. We do not intend here to employ ourselves on so great a subject as the comparison of our Prayer Book and Articles with the writings of the Fathers; but a few words will not be out of place to show how very little fitted Geraldine, or the author, is for the comparison, how little fitted to determine what is in antiquity and what is not. Indeed facts of all kinds, ancient or modern, are, we shall presently see, very subordinate matters in this "Tale of Conscience."

Now, first, we must protest against the treatment which the second General Council has received at the author's hands. Merely, as it would seem, because it was held in the same place as the fifth, it is mistaken for it, and set down as held above 170 years after its real date. And then the importance of the matter treated in the second General Council, thus assumed to be the fifth, is urged against the English Church, which it is also assumed stops short at four. What makes the mistake more notable is, that it is administered to the innocent heroine by her venerable instructor in Romanism, Mr. Everard, while she is artlessly inquiring into the history of the Councils, and exposing and lamenting her own ignorance on the subject. She says—

> "The next thing to be done is to read the acts of all the Councils, especially that of Trent, together with that previous and important one, which I always concluded to have been the most guilty, and meant to question my uncle about, namely, the Fifth General Council; for if the Church of England receives the four first as inspired by the Holy Ghost, there must have been something very particular in the Fifth, to have made the Church of England reject it... She claims four General Councils, and, I therefore conclude, she would date the apostasy of the Ancient Church from the guilty acts of the Fifth; but, no! I am now directed on to the last General Council ever held, as the date when the Holy Spirit no longer overruled the decisions of the Church! What then am I to think of these half-admitted, half-rejected intermediate Councils? And what became of Christ's promise to be with the rulers and pastors of his Church *always*, even unto the end of the world? I must have particulars of the Fifth Council. Where was it convoked?'
>
> "'At Constantinople,' replied Mr. Everard, '*and condemned the heresy of Macedonius against the divinity of the Holy Ghost.*'
>
> "'Now, can the Church of England venture to doubt this Council?' inquired Geraldine; 'Oh, she cannot, it would be impossible; *I thought the Fifth Council had been that of Constance.*'
>
> "'No, the Council of Constance was the Sixteenth,' replied Mr. Everard, 'one only intervening between it and the Council of Trent.'"
> —vol. i. pp. 219.

Mr. Everard, the philanthropic pseudo-Catholic whom we have above noticed, should not dabble in matters which he has not studied. He finds his fair disciple in the belief that the Fifth Council is the last but two, and he sets her right by telling her it is the second; not much of an approximation to the truth, we make bold to say. But this is not all. The Council of Constance, it seems, is the sixteenth, "one only intervening between it and the Council of Trent." It is clear from this that Mr. Everard is not an Ultramontane; else he would not so easily admit the authority of this Council of Constance which limited the Pope's power, and so far as it did so, was not confirmed by him. Bellarmine considers it as one of those which are "*partim confirmata, partim reprobata;*" that is, which are open to the objection which our heroine in the innocence and goodness of her heart only intends should apply to our Church, when she asks "*What am I to think* of these *half-admitted, half-rejected* intermediate Councils?" Surely Dr. Sinclair, Warden of ——, may refer his niece to Cardinal Bellarmine for an answer to this interesting question. To complete the series of blunders in this one passage, Mr. Everard not only puts the Council of Constance on a par with those of Trent and Constantinople, but makes it the *last but one before* Trent, though it was held 1414; thus cutting out, if not the Council of Florence 1439, at least that of Basil 1431, which, as Constance, "is partly confirmed and partly disowned," and the fifth Lateran, which is not more than "doubtful." If Geraldine require another variety of these half-visible, half-invisible Councils, which she thought were only found on Anglican ground, she will find it in the Council of Pisa, held a few years before Constance, which, according to Bellarmine, is "neither clearly approved nor clearly disowned." This, then, is an interesting specimen of the reasonings by which this polemical young lady, who is determined to exercise the right of private judgment, is converted to Romanism. We would undertake by similar reasonings, if she would as frankly credit them, to make her turn Jewess or fire-worshipper, or to make her fortunes terminate in a Suttee.

Nay, without any such arbitrary power over facts, it would have been no difficult matter, we suspect, to make this young lady believe anything about antiquity she was inclined to; for she is absolutely bewildered in the jungle, as it may be called, of theology into which she has thrown herself, and makes as many mistakes in the proprieties as a country girl would commit if introduced into polished society. Surely there is something most unbecoming in youth and beauty and fashion and the rest of it being represented as mounted aloft on a library stair, and labouring under the weight of books which she was to make subservient to the settlement of her religious sentiments (vol. i. p. 139). And there is something quite ludicrous in fancying that truth could be attained by such child's play. If she had confined herself to arguments (which she also uses), such as that the English system is cold, that its devotions are meagre and heavy, that it has no authority, that it does not clearly say what it believes and what it does not, that bishops' wives dress well, and that a Protestant Sunday is the dullest day in the week, we might differ from her, but still she would have quite as much right to her opinion as we to ours; but it is another matter when, in her controversy with the warden, instead of confining herself, to use her own illustration, to David's sling and stone, she pretends to have cut off Goliath's head (as she continues it) with his own sword. However, she does attempt this doughty undertaking, and she begins it with a malicious compliment to poor Mr. Everard, which is a suitable introduction to what follows:—

"She found Mr. Everard alone, she laid her hand on his book to gain his attention, and entreated him to hear what she had to say. The old gentleman looked up smiling, but started when he observed the swollen eyes and pale cheeks of his favourite, and inquired anxiously what had befallen her. Geraldine, without replying to his question, said, with forced composure, 'Mr. Everard, *I know you to be noted for your historical accuracy;* I know also that, although accused of being a dreaming speculatist on impossibilites, you are withheld by no party-feeling from seeing clearly the truth. I come therefore to tell you, and you alone, the result of my researches into Protestant Church History.'"—vol. i. p. 210.

"The result of *my* researches," as this impetuous lady most protestantly calls it, was as follows:—and let it be observed, the italics are not our doing, but hers.

"I find, during the first five centuries, first, that the Apostolical command to anoint the dying with oil, and to pray over them, was constantly observed; secondly, that an intermediate state of purification for the soul after death was an article of faith; thirdly, that the sign of the Cross was universal in the Church; fourthly, that the consecrated elements were held up to the view of the people; fifthly, that miracles attended the preaching of Christianity; and sixthly, that the prayers of the martyrs were invoked, and that supplication was made for the faithful departed. I find also that the first four Councils, which are received by our Church, *confirmed all these things, as articles of faith, against heretics;* and, in short, Mr. Everard, the perusal of these Protestant Histories of the Church has again unsettled my mind, and I am once more as miserable as when the warden arrived, and gave me temporary comfort, by holding out to me the Church of England, as the firm and gentle mother, in whose bosom I was to rest in peace."

Where Geraldine or the authoress could have picked up this piece of information, to which she has attracted attention by the italic type, we cannot even conjecture. While she was about it, she might just as soon have said that the decrees of the Council of Trent were formally confirmed by the first four Councils, or that Cardinal Pole was one of the Pope's delegates at Nicæa. It is worth observing the coincidence in conduct between Protestant and Romanist in the controversy, though after all it is but in accordance with the fundamental principles on which they respectively build their faith. The Protestant thinks it no great mistake, to throw together into one the times of Hildebrand and Leo the Tenth; and the Romanist claims the right of doing the same with the times of Cyprian and Gregory the First. And why, we would ask, should they not do so, on their view of religion? Ecclesiastical history, as they read it, is "all the same" in every age. Each system has a theological key independent of facts, by which it interprets them. Each advocates an hypothesis, contradictory indeed to the other, but at variance also with history, which lies as a *via media* between them. Each accordingly instead of going to history brings up history to its own standard, supplying from itself a complement of the history's defect or excess, reversing, discarding, straightening, or running with the course of events, as the case may require. In neither of the two is Church history supposed to present to us fixed characteristics; according to the one, it is nothing but a gradual development; according to the other, nothing but a gradual corruption; thus while they both admit, as it were, the same terms in the series, they but reverse the plus and minor signs, and sum it up into contradictory results. If baptism, for instance, or the sign of the Cross, is spoken of in the second century with reverence, the Protestant brings his peculiar theory to bear in the complacent inference that "*therefore* the rise of papal corruption showed itself *very* early;" if purgatory and indulgences are unknown doctrines at the same era, the Romanist in like manner moralizes on the "holiness of the Christian body," which did not call for their inculcation. What matters then whether one speaks of the third or sixth century, of the eleventh or sixteenth?—they have always an answer. In the middle ages the Protestant has conjured up a Church among the Paulicians with Milner, or the Waldenses with Newton, and gives up without remorse all that is visible: one age and another are equally *bad.* With the Romanist, on the other hand, one age and another are equally *good;* he views all ages with a charity as entire and as misdirected as is the Protestant's bitter and arrogant hatred of them.

Such is their concordia discors; and between the two the history of the last and most august dispensation which Providence has given us is sacrificed to human theories, being no longer considered as the deep oracle of His counsels and His ways, but as if it could be poured out and exhausted into the cisterns of scholastic systems. Not that we would impute to the present author so grave a fault as this, but that of falling in with the tone and spirit of those who are guilty of it. She takes for granted her conclusions are right, and therefore is little solicitous about the facts of the case; they *must* come right at last. And if any one here objects to us, that every one, not profoundly learned, must do this in a measure, we answer, of course he or she must, but surely is not bound to *publish* and urge as *arguments* what he has not duly inquired into.

If it were worth while to go into the particulars of the charge which has led to these remarks, we should have still more evident proofs of the looseness and cloudiness of the author's statements. For instance, she says that during the first five centuries, "an intermediate state of purification for the soul after death was an article of faith." Now what is here meant by "an article of faith?"—a definite statement necessary to be believed in order to salvation? This is to oppose the current doctrine of the Romanists, who maintain that the Church may convert doctrinal truths *into* articles of faith, and that *this* is one of such, being not determined at earliest till the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century. Again, if it was an article of faith, how could it be true, as it is, that views taken of it in these early centuries *differ* from the present Roman view? Does not all this show it was an open question, a matter of opinion, a point on which the private judgment of the individual had to decide this way or that, as he best might, or that it was not then an article of faith, whether or not the Church had the right of making it one, which is a further question. And then again the author speaks, as if *all* that the Roman Church held about purgatory were, that it is a place of purification, whereas considered not as the Catholic, but as the *Latin* Church, as found among Latins, and teaching in the west, it expressly teaches in the Catechism of Trent that purgatory is a place of fire and pain as hell is.*

Our author's under-estimation of facts in argument extends to contemporary history as well as ancient. The dreadful visitation of the cholera is only of yesterday; what happened during it our readers ought to know quite as well as she does; yet we suppose it will be news to them to be told that the English clergy were remiss in their pastoral duties on that trying occasion. However so we are informed in the work before us, viz. that from one cause or other, principally from regard to their wives and families, they shrunk from the trial; and a romantic picture is presented to us of a Roman priest being first "hooted and pelted" with "yells and execrations" by the "ignorant and capricious mob" of a town, we believe in Staffordshire, with the connivance of "the leading people, including perhaps some even of the clergy;" then the cholera breaking out, a re-action taking place, and a notion spreading that the disease was a judgment for his expulsion and ending in his triumphant return. But this is but a poor specimen of the extent to which the author's creative powers carry her; in order to do her justice, we shall present the reader with an extract of some length.

"At the hour when the bearer of the warden's note started on his commission, the Rev. Edmund Sinclair, his beautiful wife, and four elder children were enjoying, from windows that looked not on the infected town, the calm soft air of a July morning. The fair twin girls were busily employed in some little work of fancy, while their younger brothers were equally engrossed in raising a bridge, with prepared arches and bricks sent them by their uncle, the warden. No lessons were thought on that bright morning; for it was their parent's wedding-day; and besides a promised ride each on the pony, and sundry other pleasures, a magic lantern was to wind up the evening, to which all the establishment were invited. The father of these happy ones, having finished his breakfast, reclined in a reading-chair, which was likewise the gift of the elder Sinclair, partly following the theories of a modern theological author, partly watching the labours of the little architects on the carpet, and partly endeavouring not to hear the whispered secret between his little girls and their governess, respecting the present to be made of their work to papa and mamma, before they went to bed.

---

* On the history of the Roman doctrine of Purgatory, one of the latest tracts of the series called Tracts for the Times may profitably be consulted. It is scarcely necessary to add, that Geraldine's other alleged primitive points of faith are either founded on misrepresentation or are not denied by our Church.

" 'Mamma,' at length cried one of the boys, who, despairing of the scientific arrangement of the bridge, was playing at a window, 'there is the cholera signal put up at the hall. Come here, and look: there it flies from a high window, just over the cedars!'

" The whole party flew to the window, and Mr. Sinclair ascertained the fatal truth, that some one, perhaps his brother or niece, had been seized by the unsparing malady. At that instant the footman entered with a note from Dr. Sinclair, informing his brother that their departed sister's old and faithful housekeeper had been attacked by cholera,—that her mind was oppressed by some secret she wished to impart,—and that while she would not permit him, the warden, to attend her dying bed, she called out repeatedly for Mr. Edmund.

" As Mr. Sinclair perused this summons, his wife, eagerly leaning over his shoulder, devoured its contents. 'Thomas,' said she to the servant, while she secured the note, and plunged it into a flower vase filled with water, 'leave the room instantly, and desire the messenger from the hall to go round into the garden; we will throw the answer to him from the window.' The man obeyed. 'Edmund,' continued she, turning to watch the expression of her husband's countenance, 'you are not mad enough to listen to your brother's selfish suggestion? You surely do not believe one word of the old woman's preference for you?'

" 'And why not?' replied Mr. Sinclair, 'I am her parish priest; she naturally turns to me. I have held this living, the gift of General Carrington, nine years, during which time his household have constantly attended my ministry,—they have, therefore, a claim on me for the last consolations of religion.'

" 'Good heavens!' exclaimed his wife, 'do you actually think of putting yourself in the way of certain death?'

" 'I must leave consequences in the hand of God,' replied he, solemnly; 'and now, my dearest Charlotte, let me entreat you not to place these constant obstacles in the way of my obvious duty. Do not forget, as, alas! you have too often done, that, in marrying one of my holy profession, you bind yourself to assist, not to retard, your husband, in his vocation.'

" 'I cannot listen to preaching now, Edmund,' interrupted his wife, becoming extremely agitated. 'Answer me plainly,—'Yes,' or 'No,' —do you mean to go to the hall?'

"'I do,' replied he, and rushed to the door; but his wife had anticipated him, and, turning the lock, placed the key in her bosom, and sank on her knees before him.

"'Charlotte, my love, I cannot submit to this,—I cannot be detained,' cried the husband. 'Is it not enough to have prevented every personal effort I would have made amongst the sick and dying poor, but that you would force me to deny the last request of a faithful though humble friend? Charlotte, recollect yourself,—exert more Christian strength of mind, or you lose yourself in my regard.'

"'And what is an old servant, what is a friend, compared to your wife, to your children? what claims can equal theirs? and how can you answer to your conscience the bringing back to us this fatal malady?'

"'God will preserve my family,' replied Edmund Sinclair, trembling with emotion. 'My own Charlotte, think of the vows I have taken as a Gospel minister; and remember that, if unfaithful to them, I can never expect Divine assistance.'

"'I know not what were your vows as a clergyman, Edmund, for I never heard them,—I only know what they were as a husband; and, by those remembered vows, I hold you fast. I will not let you go. Is it thus you would 'love and cherish me till death do us part?' Is it thus you would desert the devoted mother of your children, or return to destroy her?'

"Mr. Sinclair here endeavoured to raise her, fondly kissing the hand he held, but at the same time turning his eyes towards the window, whence escape was perfectly feasible. Mrs. Sinclair, however, caught the direction of his looks and thoughts, and throwing her arms around him, burst into tears; while, as the wondering and tearful children gathered round them, the governess ventured to suggest, that, 'if the warden or Miss Carrington had sent for Mr. Sinclair, it would have been painful to have refused them, but that this old woman was no relation.'

"Mr. Sinclair sighed as he replied,—'Every soul is of equal value in the sight of God, and with Him all men are brothers. To the inmates of the hall I have bound myself as their pastor before God. My own love, be reasonable, be more than reasonable, be full of faith and trust, and the Master, whom I serve, will protect me and comfort you.'

"'Oh! Edmund, for God's sake do not go on talking to me in those set phrases! I know very well what the obvious duties of a clergyman are; and I am certain that carrying about the infection from house to house, is not one of them. It is your duty to obey the Government, and the Board of Health has officially commanded that the contagion should not be thus conveyed. You know all this very well, Edmund, I read you the announcement myself from the newspaper; and you also know the dissatisfaction that was expressed because the Roman Catholic priests would not obey the law of the land.'

" 'Not the law of the land, Charlotte; no punishment could attend its infraction: but now listen. I must go up to the hall, but I will not return here immediately. I will pass the night at the lodge, and then change my dress.'

" 'And there die,' interrupted the wife, 'and see me die there, and the one yet unborn! Yes! kill us both at once, and then be satisfied that you have well fulfilled your ordination vows! Go! go!' cried she, with hysterical vehemence; 'go, you love me not,—you never did, and you shall never see me more!'

" Accustomed as he had long been to similar scenes, whenever bent on the fulfilment of those clerical functions in which danger to himself might be dreaded, Edmund Sinclair had never been so powerfully affected, even during the first months of his marriage. This beautiful and devoted creature had passionately thrown herself at his feet, and her sobs echoed in his heart: he thought, also, on this their anniversary.

" The children, fully understanding that their mother was in distress, and their father in danger, joined their lamentations to hers, each little hand fastening on his dress, to force him to remain in safety, while the gentle governess again expostulated: 'Surely, Mr. Sinclair, these dear ones have the first claim on you. Excuse me, if I take the liberty to think you have, in this case, mistaken the line of duty. God can never bid you forget that you are a husband and a father.'

" Mrs. Sinclair had now ceased to sob and lament; but it was not that she listened to this last appeal in her favour, for her frame, incapable of longer sustaining this highly wrought state of feeling, sank heavily on the floor, and her rebellious grief was lost in forgetfulness.

" 'Great God!' cried the agonized husband, as, disengaging himself from the children, he raised his apparently lifeless victim, and bore her to a couch. 'Thou canst not demand the annihilation of these very affections which Thou Thyself hast blessed. Charlotte, my best treasure, I quit you not. Miss Rigby, tell the messenger from the hall that Mrs. Sinclair is too ill for me to leave her, that I send my best wishes and my blessing to poor old Goodwin, and that I entreat she will have no human preferences at such a crisis, but consent to see my excellent brother the warden. And take the children away, Miss Rigby: I wish to be left with my wife.'

" 'I cannot, sir,' exclaimed that lady, 'the door is, you know, locked; and even, while fainting, Mrs. Sinclair still grasps the key.'

" Tears gushed into Edmund's eyes as he drew forth his Charlotte's now unresisting hand from the folds of her dress: it fell powerless, and dropped the key. The governess and children withdrew; and, no sooner was he freed from witnesses, than sinking on his knees, by the couch of his still insensible wife, and burying his face in the cushions, Edmund Sinclair gave way to the remorseful emotions of his soul,—for he had yielded to the enervating effect of earthly love, and, in the husband, lost the priest of God!"—vol. i. pp. 41—48.

This is much worse than Geraldine's confusing the second and fifth General Councils, and Mr. Everard's annihilation of the Council of Basil; it is a very shameful fabrication; but more comes presently. Not content with accusing clergymen's wives of keeping their husbands from their spiritual duties, this "Tale of Conscience," as it styles itself, proceeds to a further charge, so odious, that we almost retract what we have conjectured, and are tempted to deny that its writer is a woman. It actually accuses a clergyman's wife of teasing her husband out of a secret committed to him in confession on a death-bed, and then without a day's delay spreading it among her gossips. Now considering this must be meant to intimate what is natural and usual in the English Church, and cannot be taken as intended as an extraordinary exception to general rule, and is deliberately put on paper, not by a foreigner at a distance, but by one who has seen much of English society, or at least has taken, in some of its features, a shrewd and discriminating survey of it, we do marvel that he or she has had the heart and still more the head to prefer a charge which is as stupid as it is malicious. Why, it beats the story we have lately heard something about somewhere, of Pope Gregory and his fish-pond of infants' skulls; for what is Pope Gregory to us? and, though he was our great benefactor, still one can understand men, brought up as they are, not feeling any great sensitiveness for the honour of one who died hundreds of years before we were born, and whose existence and graces have never been thrust upon their senses by sight and touch and hearing. It is but ordinary and bearable irreverence to heap accusations upon one who after all was but a pope, considering all popes must be bad men; but with all the advantages of sight and hearing, friendly intercourse, the claims of society, and the influence of personal intimacies, thus deliberately to sacrifice our clergy and their wives to a mere *theory*, the theory of Romanism, which requires that *facts* should be thus reversed, and the course of things turned inside out, evinces a hardihood which is characteristic of Rome, and which is too extreme and barefaced to excite any angry or impatient feeling. It is their loss who believe it.

Indeed, the authoress seems to feel she has gone too far, and shows signs of compunction; for presently we are favoured, as a set off, with a little sketch of a good parson's wife, or in the words of Mr. Everard, whose luck it has been to discover this rare jewel, "*the one* good clergyman's wife of my acquaintance, "the Protestant sister of charity, the 'reverend mother' of her "little parish."—vol. i. p. 293.

And now perhaps we have said enough to satisfy the reader's curiosity as to this tale, which has made a sensation in some circles. It contains an amusing exposure of Ultra-Protestantism; it may be useful in shaming members of our Church into a more consistent profession of its principles: it is quite harmless as a controversial defence of the Church of Rome.

Art. III.—1. *Lectures on Justification.* By John Henry Newman, B.D., Fellow of Oriel College, and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1838.

2. *The Primitive Doctrine of Justification, investigated: relatively to the several Definitions of the Church of Rome and the Church of England; and with a special Reference to the Opinions of the late Mr. Knox, as published in his Remains.* By George Stanley Faber, B.D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury. London: Seeley and Burnside. 1837.

It is allowed, we presume, by all who are fairly entitled to call themselves Christians, that fallen man stands in need both of pardoning mercy, and of sanctifying grace; that both these blessings have been purchased for him by the mysterious and atoning virtue of the Redeemer's blood; that, through faith, the redemption thus offered to the whole world, may be personally realized to every individual in it; but that, without a believing heart, no man can receive the offered redemption, or retain it when bestowed. Thus popularly stated, nothing can well appear more transparently perspicuous, than the scheme, which the God of all mercy and consolation has devised, for our recovery from moral and spiritual ruin. And yet, it is unspeakably painful to reflect how soon the transparency seems clouded, when the "heavenly vision" is intently gazed upon by the eye of disputatious curiosity. One might almost imagine that celestial Truth resented this inquisitive examination of her very essence,—this invasion of her inner sanctuary; and that, in order to baffle and humiliate the pride of mortal wisdom, she suddenly arrayed herself in a shadowy mantle, when approached by them that would analyse and decompose the glorious element which forms her tabernacle. It would seem, as if the column of flame before us was, then, to our confusion, changed into a pillar of darkness: that so, the wise and the prudent should be left to *stumble on the dark mountains;* while the simple and artless wayfarer was walking in the light, and rejoicing that, at every moment of his progress, the way of the Lord was plain before his face.

Such are the thoughts that are apt to rush in, and to disquiet us, whenever we behold the pure atmosphere of the Christian verity thickening as it were into thunder-clouds, and then descending upon the earth in angry and destructive torrents, and laying waste, for a time, the peace and happiness of man. The spectacle is one which makes us feel as if wrath were going forth against that impatient spirit of inquiry, which is wandering evermore over dry and thorny places, *seeking rest and finding none.* And, when we are assailed by these sorrowful imaginings, we find no comfort but in the prospect of that time, when we shall no longer see, as through a glass, darkly; but shall know, even as we are known.

Others, however, there are, who look more cheerfully upon the fermenting, and sometimes tempestuous, agitation of the elements; as if this were a needful and salutary process, whereby alone the world of theology could be kept from falling into deadness and stagnation. And, among these, may be numbered that hardy and adventurous thinker, Alexander Knox. The spirit of hopefulness is predominant throughout the whole compass of his writings. There is scarcely an error, whether in religion or philosophy, which, according to his scheme of thought, has been without its appointed office and commission. Nay—*the very final cause* of heresy itself, in his persuasion, is, the eventual development and confirmation of the truth. And, as for the various schools of theology,—in his sight, they were actually preordained, for the express purpose of guarding respectively, from age to age, certain departments and regions of the truth, which might, otherwise, have suffered for want of the protection thus especially provided for them. Augustine, for instance, was appointed to labour at the foundations of the Christian character, and to keep down its lofty pretensions, and towering thoughts; lest human merit should exalt itself, to the dishonour of Divine Grace: while the office of Chrysostom, and others of his type, was to raise up and to adorn the superstructure, that the whole might grow into an holy temple to the Lord. The province of the Schoolmen, again, was to discipline the mind to doctrinal precision, and to exercise the understanding in matters which are external to the soul of man. The Mystics, on the contrary, were eminently useful in watching the interior movements of the soul, and in graduating the scale of spiritual proficiency, and in marking the growth of the inward man towards the fulness of the Christian strength and stature. So that, by the action of these antagonist forces, a right direction might, ultimately, be given to the mind of all Christendom. In conformity with these views, he seems to have imagined, that the correction of erroneous principles might, in some instances, chance to be premature; that a hasty attempt at the reformation of opinions, would be nothing better than a vain contention against the order of Providence; and that, even if successful, it would only cut short the period of serviceable agency assigned to this or that peculiar system. We find him, accordingly, declaring his conviction, that "no "writer, on this earth, is more misunderstood, or misrepresented, "than St. Paul;" and, yet, immediately adding,—"I am, however, "little less persuaded that the misconception has had its use—its "important use; and that the correction of it, where it has pre- "vailed, would, at any other period that the present, have been "impracticable, if attempted, and pernicious if accomplished."*

Now, all this is extremely consolatory. There is, at present, a great stirring of opinions among us, relative to certain matters which, as many persons imagined, had been fixed, since the days of Luther, as immoveably as the pillars of heaven. For the last three centuries, a large portion of the Protestant world has directed "the office and devotion of its view," towards the Reformation, as stedfastly almost, as if that were the era of the first promulgation of Christianity. Of late, however, some counter-revolutionary symptoms have begun to manifest themselves: and it is highly satisfactory to be assured that the movement has taken place just at the right moment! A. Knox himself appears among the foremost of the watchmen who have made it their business to observe the signs of the times, and to note the proper season for enterprize and action. And, being satisfied that the hour was come, he girded himself up,—uttered his voice,—and startled the high Protestant community with the assertion, that they had mistaken the doctrine of St. Paul relative to the vital subject of justification.

How his memory has been assailed for thus daring to violate the citadel of the Reformed Faith, is now generally known. He has been accused of an attempt to throw us back into the arms of Popery. He has been charged with exalting the traditions of men above the oracles of God. It has even been affirmed, with a mixture of compassion and horror, that he lived and died without a Saviour! All this tragical outcry, had he survived to hear it, would probably have inflicted very little disturbance upon his spirit. And, we should apprehend that his admirers and friends need be under no great alarm for his good name on earth, or, we may venture reverentially to add, for his destiny in heaven. If

---

* Knox's Remains, vol. i. pp. 234, 235.

A. Knox died without a Saviour, we can hardly think, without trembling, on the case of those, who flew upon him with a virulence, which the Saviour would surely have visited with his sternest rebuke and condemnation.

A. Knox, however, is now gone to his rest; and has left the contest respecting the true doctrine of justification to other combatants. Two of these are now before us: and they appear under circumstances not very common at the present day. It usually happens, in our times, that the conflict touching debateable matters of the Christian faith, is carried on between parties, one of which appeals to the Scriptures alone, in high disdain of all assistance from the voice of primitive antiquity, towards a safe interpretation of the Scriptures; while the other party insists on the value, and the authority, of primitive antiquity, on all questions, involving doubt or difficulty touching the mind of the Spirit by whom the Scriptures were dictated. But this is not the case with Mr. Newman and Mr. Faber. Both of them, of course, appeal to the Scriptures, as the only ultimate authority. Both of them, too, appeal to the sense of primitive and Catholic antiquity. And, lastly, both of them appeal to the Homilies and Formularies of the Anglo-Catholic Church. Nevertheless, each of them has arrived at a different conclusion!

Before we proceed to a consideration of their arguments and statements, we are tempted to offer, as it were parenthetically, a few moderate and simple words, respecting the principle upon which these divines have conducted their inquiries, namely, a renunciation of what is called the *right of private judgment.* Nothing, we suspect, can well be more crude, more confused, and more full of emptiness, than the notions very commonly entertained respecting the unlimited liberty of prophesying, which is claimed by the high and rigorous Protestant Defenders of the Faith. They seem to imagine that the champions of the Catholic Theology are disposed to call in question the *abstract right* of every individual to search the Scriptures for himself, and to form his own judgment relative to the principles and doctrines therein contained. Now, unless we egregiously mistake them, the champions of the Catholic Theology do no such thing. These men have too much common sense to deny the mere *abstract right* of every human being to do the most silly, the most perilous, and the most fool-hardy things, that can enter into man's imagination. It never comes into their heads to dispute the *abstract right* of any individual to ruin himself, if such should be his pleasure. If they should chance to meet a traveller on his journey through a difficult country, the roads and passes of which were utterly unknown to him, and who yet should insist on his right to find out his own way for himself, in resolute disregard of all guidance from finger-posts, or from the information of persons well acquainted with the localities,—they would never think of disputing the right and privilege of the adventurer to lose himself in a forest, or to get engulfed in the mire, or, at best, to find, after much weariness and toil, that he was wide, by many a league, from the place of his destination. They would, doubtless, benevolently warn him of his danger; they would remonstrate with him on his folly and his obstinacy; and they would entreat him to remember that he would have himself to thank for the disastrous perplexities and difficulties which might befal him on his journey. Perhaps they might even do more; and tell him, that if his wanderings should chance to have a fatal termination, he might have something like the guilt of suicidal rashness to answer for. But they would never dream of collaring the freeborn man, or of handing him over to the constable, or of consigning him to the cage or to the stocks. Now this case appears to us to illustrate, with tolerable precision, the principles of those who contend against the ultra-protestant licence of *private judgment* in matters of religion. They contend against it, because they believe it to be imminently dangerous; because they know it to be in opposition to the maxims and the habits by which men are guided in the prosecution of their temporal interests; because they feel that no man in his right mind would venture to set up his individual opinion against the collective wisdom and knowledge of former ages. They say to every inquirer after divine truth--by all means, search the Scriptures; and then, if there be modesty and humility in your nature, you will probably soon feel yourself compelled to exclaim, with the eunuch, *How can I understand, except some one should guide me?* And what guide is so sure, as the voice of the Church; in other words, the unanimous deliverance of Christian teachers and expositors, commencing from the earliest ages, and continued on through centuries? And if, in spite of all remonstrance, the inquirer should reply, that he scorned to acknowledge for his master, either any one man, or any collection of men, whether ancient or modern,—nothing would remain to be done, but to tell him, that if such were his resolution, he must even follow it, at his own peril. But, assuredly, there would be no invasion of his free-agency, no violation of his abstract right. The Church of Rome, indeed, knows nothing of this free agency or abstract right. She not only visits it with the spiritual scourge of the Anathema; but she calls upon the secular arm to chastise it with the scorpions of corporeal torture. But, not so the Church of England. She, sorrowfully but not angrily, consigns the recusant to another tribunal, where justice will be finally administered in mercy.

But then, we are sometimes told, that to resort to mortal teachers, is to proclaim, that " the Scriptures are not light, but " darkness; and that the word of man interpreting, is clearer than " the word of God interpreted; that is, that man's word will be " clearer than God's; a rush-light brighter than the sun!" Then, why, in the name of all that is wonderful, why do the very men who tell us this, surround themselves with rush-lights; while they scornfully cast away the torches which were lighted from the altar, in the days of Apostles, and of Apostolic men, and which have been passed on to us, from hand to hand, through a long series of generations? Why do they heap up to themselves expositors and commentators, while the Fathers are well nigh cast to the moles and the bats? Why do they hang upon the lips of a favourite preacher, as if his words were able to breed in them divine and infallible faith; while the volumes of Clement, or Cyprian, or Chrysostom, are treated as mere repertories of licentious and fantastic tradition? Why, in short, are they,—who are foremost to assure us that the Fathers were but men, and liable to error,—why are they content to derive their nourishment chiefly from the ordinance of preaching, instead of living by every word that proceedeth *directly* from the mouth of God himself?

But, to return to Mr. Newman and Mr. Faber. And, first, of the former. We have several times perused Mr. Newman's volume; and, in some parts, desperately hard reading we have found it! We say not this to the disparagement of the work. On the contrary, this is our testimony to the labour, the patience, the erudition, which he has brought to bear upon the subject. The writer is too awfully impressed with the solemn importance of the questions before him, to content himself with puncturing their surface. He has delved deeply into the bowels of the matter; and has, consequently, provided a pretty severe trial of strength and endurance, for all who would profitably attend him throughout his task. He has, however, occasionally relieved the severity of their toil by bursts of such eloquence as can issue only from a mind which, throughout all its faculties, is possessed and pervaded by a sense of unseen and eternal things. Here and there, indeed, he seems to have bewildered himself—(at least, he has occasionally bewildered *us*)—in the labyrinth of scholastic subtlety. And, once or twice, his imagination seems to have seduced him a little way into the realm of shadowy and mystical fancies. But he speedily emerges from the land of visions; and resumes his course, with vigorous and patient tread, along the ground of substantial disquisition.

The first question examined by him is,—what are we to understand by the justification of a Christian man? With respect to this question, the attention of divines is, most commonly, divided between those two schools which stand at the antipodes of each other,—the Romish and the Lutheran. The Romish doctrine is well-known. As defined at the Council of Trent, it affirms that we are justified, not by the imputation to us of perfect righteousness, nor by the imputation to us of faith for righteousness; but by the infusion of virtue from Jesus Christ into the human soul. The virtue thus infused, becomes *inherent* in us; it justifies us, or makes us righteous, before God; it empowers us to satisfy the divine law; and, provided we depart in grace, it enables us *truly to merit* eternal life. The same doctrine, nevertheless, protests against the boastfulness or self-confidence of man. It acknowledges the whole to be a gift procured for us, by the merit of Christ, from the goodness of God; which goodness is so great, that, what are truly his gifts, he willeth to be estimated as our merits.

All this, doubtless, sounds very vile and odious, in Protestant ears! And yet, this is the doctrine which, as Rome asserts, was received by the Catholic Church from the Apostles; and which, through the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, she has ever since constantly retained. Now, whether the doctrine be Apostolical, or not, in *other* respects,—there is, upon the face of it, one fatal blemish, one " damned spot," which never can have been fixed there by Apostolic hands. The doctrine, it is true, ascribes the whole blessing of justification to the free mercy of God. But then, it makes the gift, when once bestowed, entirely our own; so entirely, as to become, to us, a source of true and positive desert. The merit, which was originally Christ's, is, in baptism, made over to ourselves, as completely, as a possession or an estate is transferred from one person to another, by a formal deed of gift. We may, thenceforward, cultivate it, as it were wholly on our own account. It may, indeed, become worthless for want of cultivation; or, it may, by the terms of the grant, be forfeited by gross and long continued abuse or neglect. But, if it should prosper in our hands, we may accumulate the proceeds even to superfluity; and leave a surplus to be disposed of, by proper trustees, for the benefit of less diligent and more necessitous occupiers. That the Romish system would bear this construction —nay, that it invited this construction,—is manifest from the results. We have all heard and read enough of that mighty reservoir, into which the superabundant merits of the Saints were constantly overflowing: and, of the manner in which the waters were distributed, for the refreshment and comfort of those,—who could afford to pay for it!

In this system, Luther, it is well known, could find no anchorage for his soul. He could get no rest or peace, until the fountain of divine mercy was unsealed to him by the doctrine of justification by faith,—and by faith only;—which doctrine he accordingly proclaimed to be the article of a standing or a falling Church. According to this system, we have nothing, within ourselves, which is worthy of the name of righteousness: and our justification consists in the ascription to us of a quality which does not, at any time, in reality belong to us. We are just, only by what is usually called a *forensic* imputation. Our righteousness has, in fact, no existence, if we may so speak, but in the mind of God. And faith is the instrument, or the means, or the condition, by which the advantages of this gracious estimate are originally obtained for us; and, by which, only, we can hope to secure a continuance of the blessing.

Now, the difficulties of this scheme appeared to A. Knox, to be absolutely insuperable. He professed himself utterly unable to imagine that the Deity would even confer upon us a title, to which there was nothing actually correspondent in ourselves. He seems to have considered it as unworthy of God,—and therefore as impossible,—that God should declare any one to be righteous,—or account him to be righteous,—or deal with him as righteous,—otherwise than with reference to some moral quality inherent in that individual. And this difficulty drove him back into a theory which, it cannot be denied, approximates very closely to the exploded theology of Rome. The approximation, however, did not much discompose him. His greatest embarrassment arose from the manifestly imputative, or *forensic*, language of certain of our own formularies. But he extricated himself from the objection, by affirming that God *pronounces* us to be righteous, simply because he has previously *made* us so.

The theory of Mr. Newman,—(which, as he contends, is no other than that which was entertained by the Catholic Church, and subsequently adopted by the most eminent of our own Divines)—takes a middle course between the Romish and Lutheran extremities. He conceives that we are justified,—not by the infusion of a moral quality into the soul, as the Romanists maintain;—*not* by a *mere* imputation, as affirmed by Luther and his followers;—but, that our justification consists in the presence of the Saviour himself within us, as effected and administered by the mysterious agency of the Spirit. We are accounted righteous in the sight of God, because, by his gracious and mighty working, there is within us, after baptism, the very author and finisher of our salvation,—the very source of all pardoning mercy and sanctifying grace,—the very fountain which cleanseth from all sin,—the very well-spring which gushes out unto everlasting life. In short, justification is, with Mr. Newman, a comprehensive name for every imaginable spiritual blessing, which the Christian dispensation can possibly confer on man. The following are his own words:—

> "It may be remarked that whatever blessings in detail we ascribe to justification, are ascribed in Scripture to this sacred indwelling. For instance, is justification *remission of sins?* the Gift of the Spirit conveys it, as is evident from the Scripture doctrine about baptism; 'one baptism for the remission of sins.' Is justification *adoption* into the family of God? in like manner the Spirit is expressly called the Spirit of adoption, 'the Spirit whereby we cry, Abba, Father.' Is justification *reconciliation* with God? St. Paul says, 'Jesus Christ is in you, unless ye be reprobates.' Is justification *life?* the same Apostle says, 'Christ liveth in me.' Is justification given to *faith?* he also prays, 'that Christ may dwell in' Christians' 'hearts by faith.' Does justification lead to holy *obedience?* Our Lord assures us that 'he that abideth in Him and He in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.' It is through justification that we rejoice *in hope of the glory* of God? in like manner 'Christ in us' is said to be 'the hope of glory.' Christ then is our righteousness by dwelling in us by the Spirit; He justifies us by entering into us, He continues to justify us by remaining in us. *This* is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation; but through God's mercy, the very presence of Christ."—pp. 166, 167.

Now, on this, we have principally to remark, that, if any writer chooses to indicate the whole assemblage of privileges and benefits provided for us in the Christian economy by a single word, —be that word justification, or salvation, or redemption, or any other term,—there is, in the abstract, no good reason for denying him that indulgence; provided always, that due notice of his intention be given to the reader. Whether such a proceeding be convenient or judicious, or not, is a distinct question; the determination of which may depend on a variety of circumstances. The use of the single term, however, *may* possibly tend to produce confusion and disturbance in the mind of multitudes, who have long been accustomed to a different phraseology. No orthodox Christian, for instance, that we are aware of, disputes that every blessing above enumerated by Mr. Newman, is actually comprised and wrapped up in the Covenant of Grace. On this point, there, surely, cannot be a moment's dissension between the most rigid Protestant, and the purest Catholic. But then, the

Protestant has been taught and accustomed to observe that, in the Covenant of Grace, there are certain things which Christ has promised to do *for* us; and certain other things which he has promised to do *in* us. The things which Christ has promised to do *for* us, in the Protestant nomenclature, are generally denoted by the term *justification;* those which He has promised to do *in* us, by the term *sanctification.* It does not follow from this, that the Protestant contemplates these blessings as things which, though they may be formally different, are separable from each other in the mind and counsels of the Deity. Neither is it to be supposed that he denies, that both these gifts are essential to our ultimate acceptance. But then, to say the least, he finds the above distinction convenient; and, he moreover, believes it to be eminently useful. It is a permanent, serviceable, and compendious testimony, against the Romish error, which tempts us to merge the remembrance of absolving mercy, in the triumphs of infused, inherent, and truly meritorious righteousness. And, it really does appear to us, that some very cogent reasons, indeed, ought to be produced, before we attempt to deprive him of whatever benefit or aid he can derive from this mode of statement.

That such cogent reasons may be produced, is, obviously enough, the persuasion of Mr. Newman. The Scriptures—the primitive Christian writers—the schoolmen—the Romish divines—the Protestant divines—all have been painfully examined by him; and the result has been, a firm conviction, on his part, that the above Protestant statement is a vicious statement; that it gives a confused and imperfect view of the manner of God's dealing with our fallen race; that it has a tendency to keep down our thoughts in the dreary region of our own infirmities, instead of lifting them up in aspiration after all that is pure, and holy, and sublime. It stifles, as he conceives, all hopeful reliance on the work of the Spirit in our hearts; and suffers the faculties and powers, which the Fall has left us, to run to waste, in wayward and feeble musings, touching the dark and helpless condition of our nature. And, thus, it may gradually convert the Christian soul into a gloomy chamber of imagery, haunted by forms as shadowy and variable, as the fantastic shapes which the eye of fancy discerns in the fleeting clouds of heaven; whereas, in fact, the soul is designed to be no other than the House of God, wherein the Divine Shekinah may dwell, as truly as it did of old in the Jewish sanctuary, and, beyond comparison, more gloriously. So that, when we are chiefly occupied in watching the caprices and vicissitudes of our frames, and feelings, and conflicts, and experiences,—instead of fixing our regards on the unchanging Power which abides within us,—we are guilty of something like a "specious idolatry." We are, in reality, occupied with ourselves, while we ought to be absorbed in adoring contemplation of the High and Holy One, who deigns to make the heart of man his tabernacle; in order that self may be, as it were, forgotten and lost, and that He may be all in all,—the Alpha and the Omega of our thoughts. Mr. Newman further contends that, the righteousness and sanctity which result from the soul's intimate and incessant communion with the sovereign perfection, have, in them, a proper and formal justifying quality; seeing that, albeit comparatively dim and faint, they still are reflections—from the soul, as from a mirror—of essential and uncreated brightness. The Deity, when looking on our better deeds and thoughts, is contemplating only a partial emanation from himself, which cannot fail to be pleasing and acceptable in his sight. And, if so, it follows that whatever holy desires, or good counsels, or just works, may shine forth in the life of the Christian, may, truly and safely, be regarded as elements of his justification. The mirror, indeed, which reflects the splendours of the indwelling Godhead, may be foully soiled, and meanly fitted for its sacred office. But, by a mysterious operation, it may gradually acquire a purer polish, and even a truer form; till, at length, it becomes worthy to render back, in the sight of men and angels, a discernible image of the Divinity Himself. And the satisfaction imparted by a consciousness of this advancement from brightness to brightness, and from glory to glory, is solid, substantial, and divinely animating. Whereas, they who are strangers to any justification but that which is external to themselves,—they who know and feel nothing of an interior and indwelling righteousness—are in danger of wandering in the midst of shadows. Their comfort, if they have any, is often little better than "such stuff as dreams are made of."

Such, if we have rightly collected his meaning—(and we have laboured most conscientiously to do so)—are the views entertained by Mr. Newman, relative to the scheme of man's justification. He will, of course, be prepared to hear those views loudly—(we hope, not angrily)—questioned. There are, doubtless, many who will be ready to protest against the faithfulness of the portraiture given by him of the *Protestant* doctrine, as illustrated by its effects. And, to say the truth, whether that doctrine be correct or not, we can hardly believe it to be fairly chargeable with all the dangerous, and even fatal consequences, which he has so confidently ascribed to it. The doctrine, if abused, *may*, unquestionably, taint the soul with the deadly antinomian venom; or, may drug it with an opiate, which shall people the brain with visions and with phantoms; and may so unnerve the man, that he shall be unable to go forth like the worthies of old, who, through faith, *wrought* righteousness, and, out of weakness were made strong. But we seriously doubt whether Mr. Newman has not—though quite unconsciously—exaggerated and multiplied the evils actually produced by the system which he denounces as erroneous. He himself, indeed, confesses that the advocates of the rigid Lutheran scheme, are frequently distinguished by a life and conversation much higher and holier than the principles which they profess. And this one consideration, though it furnishes no excuse for apathy or indifference in the search after truth, supplies, at least, abundant reason for extreme caution, in estimating, and bringing to a test, the principles themselves.

It is utterly impossible for us, in a brief essay like this, to conduct the reader through the maze of investigation, by which Mr. Newman has arrived at his conclusion. The whole pith and marrow of the question, controversially considered, may be found in his Appendix, on the Formal Cause of Justification. We, however, are compelled to content ourselves with a somewhat desultory statement of certain reflexions which occurred to us, in the course of our examination of the whole volume.

In considering, then, the condition of a Christian, it appeared to us that the matter might be intelligibly exhibited something after this manner. Let perfect obedience be represented by a right line: man's obedience, by a curve line, more or less irregular, *below* it; but approaching it, sometimes more closely, and sometimes less; and, here and there, all but touching that line. Now, nothing short of a path along the line of perfection can satisfy the justice of God. Nothing short of this is fully entitled to the name of obedience. If, then, through the mysterious virtue of the atonement, we are accepted, just as if we were walking along the right line, while, in fact, we are walking in the inferior one, it is obvious that there must be, virtually, a process of *imputation* constantly going on in our favour. Every step below the upper line, is a violation of the law, a short-coming of perfect obedience,—that is, a *sin*. And, if so, our justification must, in this life, from first to last, essentially and formally consist "rather "in the remission of our sins, than in the perfection of our "virtues,"—conformably to the confession of Augustine. The curve,—as we proceed and gather steadiness and courage,—may become less and less irregular, and may approach, more and more nearly, to the line which represents perfection. But, while we are on our way through this world, every point in the curve will always be beneath that line, and will never once actually touch it. In other words, we must remain sinners to the last. And, if we are dealt with, as if our obedience were undeviating, must it not be, throughout, in consequence of what we may venture to call a merciful and gracious *fiction?* a *fiction*, however, which does not compromise the truth or justice of God: not his truth, for it tends to no deception; not his justice, seeing that a full, sufficient, and perfect satisfaction has been made, for his violated law.

And, now comes the question, whether there is any thing, in the inward life and condition of a Christian, of which it can safely be averred, that it shares, with the merciful imputation above described, in the office of *justifying* the sinner. And, here, we must confess, we are at a loss for any thing like a graphic or *geometrical* illustration of the case. It is clear that, if our goings forth, along the inferior line, are to contribute towards constituting us truly righteous and obedient men, it must be by virtue of something different from the mere course and direction of our steps. The most sainted among men are never quite in the right path. There must consequently, while we are beside or beneath that path, be something in the motives which animate our exertions, or in the powers vouchsafed for our aid, to give a peculiar value, a sort of preternatural dignity, to our struggles, before we can derive any confidence in our efforts, as a formal cause of our *justification* in the sight of God. And, *that* something, as we have seen already, Mr. Newman discovers, in the sacred presence of the Saviour in our souls, by the ministration of the Spirit. The Christian does not go forth upon his journey as a common man. He has that within him, which essentially distinguishes him from all others who start upon the race that is set before them. His inward man is pervaded by a life, of which it is but little to say that it exceeds the moral vitality of our unsanctified nature, as much as the mental surpasses the animal capacity. And this it is which imparts to his labours and designs a character of righteousness, which could not otherwise belong to them. He toils onward, in the greatness of his way, not in his own strength, but in the strength of Him who is the source of all power and might, and who dwells in him, as in a temple. He is righteous, therefore, not by any inherent rectitude of his own nature, but by virtue of the interior presence of his Saviour. His obedience, although its course is not coincident with the line of perfection, is nevertheless *accepted*, in consideration of the pure and celestial fountain from which it flows. And this *acceptableness*, as Mr. Newman contends, enters essentially into the process of his *justification*. To express the matter in his own words:—" In this, I conceive to lie the unity of the " Catholic doctrine,—that we are saved by Christ's imputed " righteousness; *and*, by our own inchoate righteousness at " once." (App. p. 414.) In a word,—(to resort to an illustration of Mr. Newman's,)—there is a certain line, which, although beneath the line of perfection, separates the walk of the renovated man, from the walk of the natural man. (p. 99.) To lift us above that line, is the work of Divine grace. And, if our own exertions (assisted, as they will be, by the power within us,) should be sufficient to keep us from falling below that line, then may it be truly said that those exertions are instrumental to our continuance in the state of justification.

One formidable objection to this representation, is, the extreme difficulty of fixing upon the boundary, which fences off the region in which we are safe, from the region in which we must be lost. The line of perfect obedience is clear and distinct, and unchangeable as the holiness of God. But who shall undertake to describe the other? Not, however, to dwell on this,—there is another thing which can scarcely fail to strike any man, who contemplates this system attentively; namely, that it is, throughout, a system of imputation, though in a splendid and magnificent disguise. In spite of all precaution, *imputation* (or, correlatively, non-imputation) will shine through the *whole* texture of the scheme. To say that " Grace triumphs, through righteousness, *in spite of the remains of sin*,"* what is it, but to say that *the remains of sin* are *imputed* no longer; that they are not suffered to mar, or to disturb, the triumphant achievements of Divine mercy; that God no longer beholds iniquity or perverseness in his people? To affirm that our doings have in them a truly justifying quality, because the author of all righteousness is given to us, as an inmate with our own spirits, is virtually to affirm that God looks upon our deeds, not as they are, actually, in themselves, but as they are done in Christ. And what is this, but another mode of expressing that we are *reputed* actually righteous, because we have that within us which mightily *tends* to make us so? It is true that a Christian man may be able to do what a heathen man cannot. He may perform an obedience which God can accept, without any impeachment of his holiness and majesty. But, why is such obedience acceptable? Why, but because the imperfection which, more or less, adheres *to every act of it*, is mercifully overlooked; and because there is One present with us, with whom the Father is always well pleased, and whose perfect righteousness he vouchsafes to ascribe to us, and to reckon of it, as if it were truly, naturally, and inherently, our own. A Christian saint, indeed, may be righteous, as compared with the most virtuous and exemplary heathen, and may be so esteemed in the sight of God and man. But the Christian saint himself must remain, throughout his whole course, exposed to the curse of the law, if his performances (whatever may be their source) were brought to a judicial scrutiny, instead of a paternal estimate. Whether, therefore, under the law, or under the gospel, must not our language always be, *Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord; for, in thy sight shall no man living be justified?*

---

* Newman, p. 99.

That the forensic or imputative notion enters into the very essence and formality of our justification, would seem to follow, irresistibly, from the words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 21; *He hath made him* (Christ) *to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God, in him.* For it is beyond all dispute that, if sin be ascribed to Christ, it can be only by imputation. And, if so, how are we to avoid the conclusion, that, correlatively, it is by imputation only, that righteousness can ever be ascribed to us? This argument is very strongly urged by Mr. Faber (p. 133, &c.). And it cannot be denied that his view of the matter is powerfully corroborated by the language of Chrysostom; who, after insisting that sin is here ascribed to Christ, and righteousness to sinners, in the most express and forcible terms that could possibly be used, continues thus:—" It " is the righteousness of God, when we are justified,—not from " works, *in which case it would be needful that no stain should be " found,*—but, from grace, where all sin is made to disappear."* It will hardly be contended that Chrysostom is here speaking only with reference to works performed before justification: seeing that, of no works, performed either before or after, can it be predicated, that they are *without a stain.* And the inference is, that if, at any time, we are dealt with as righteous, it must be in a sense corresponding to that in which Christ was dealt with as a sinner.

That, in a sort of secondary sense, indeed, our own inchoate righteousness is subservient to our justification, we apprehend few Protestants of any class or type will be disposed to deny; although they may employ different modes of phraseology, for the expression of their feelings and opinions. Mr. Newman himself, for instance,—(though sorely displeased at the presumption of the Lutheran divines, for ruling that we are not *really* righteous, when the Almighty has declared that we are),—Mr. Newman himself is content to call our inchoate righteousness an *improper* formal cause of our justification. (Appendix, p. 427.) The Anglican divines maintain that we are saved *in* Christ's righteousness, yet *not without our own.* (App. p. 414.) And the strictest disciples of the Reformed school, in effect, say much the same thing. For, although they shrink from assigning to our obedience any power to impress upon us an internal form or character of righteousness, they yet allow that there is, (no matter how or why,) an intimate connexion between our justification and our sanctification, between our absolution from guilt, and our striving after innocence and rectitude; and, that where the latter is not, the former will be little better than a nullity. All parties, therefore, seem to contend for the necessity and the efficacy of sanctifying grace, as well as of pardoning mercy. And, if so,—what is all this endless debating, but vexation of spirit, and weariness of flesh?

---

* Chrysost. Hom. ad loc.

When brought to a practical issue, the grand question, after all, is this: be the worth or dignity of our obedience what it may, can any man look back upon it with a confidence at all approaching to that, with which he contemplates the atoning blood, by which the remembrance of his frailties and his trespasses is washed away? Can he prevail upon himself to reckon much upon the proper *justifying* virtue of the best and holiest deeds, which he has done, in the days of his probation? Augustine, we have seen, could not: for, he has taught us that, in this life, our righteousness consists rather in the remission of our sins, than in the perfection of our virtues. St. Ambrose could not; for his words are these,—"I will not glory because I am righteous, but "because I am redeemed; not because I am exempt from sins, but "because my sins have been remitted; not because I have been "profited, or because any man hath profited me,—but, because "Christ is an Advocate for me with the Father,—but, because "the blood of Christ has been poured out for me." Pope Gregory could not; for he exclaims:—"The Righteous Advocate "will defend us, as just and blameless, because we know and "condemn ourselves as unjust. Let us, therefore, put our trust "not in our tears, not in our actions, but in the pleading of our "advocate." St. Bernard could not; for he says, on his sick bed,—"I confess that I am unworthy, and unable, by my own "deserts, to obtain the kingdom of heaven. But he is worthy, "who obtains it by a double right,—the right of inheritance from "the Father, and the merits of his own passion. He himself, "being content with the former of these, has freely given the "other to me. And, in resting my claim upon this gift, I shall "never be confounded." Lastly, our own Hooker could not; for, even though it may be true, that, as Mr. Newman has observed, his views were not finally matured till towards the close of his life, yet there was one thing in which he was stedfast and immoveable to the very last. His dying words are engraved on our hearts: "Lord, I plead, not my righteousness, but the forgiveness "of my unrighteousness, for the sake of Him who came to pur"chase a pardon for penitent sinners."* When we are looking forward, indeed, it may well become us to work as if our strivings were able, of themselves, to win for us the crown of glory, and honour, and immortality. Then, if any, is the time for us to render ourselves up to the heart-stirring thought, that all things are possible to him who has, for an inhabitant of his soul, the spirit of Christ himself, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. But, when the day of retrospect arrives,—when we reflect how often these splendid possibilities have gone down in miserable failures,—when we think upon the dismal fact that, throughout a great portion of our course, it would seem as if Christ had dwelled with us in vain,—then are we constrained to cast away, as bordering upon impiety, all hope of justification, save that which rests on pardoning and redeeming mercy. The very recollection of the mighty gift which we may have suffered to remain dormant and inert within us, must, of itself, be sufficient to bear us down with shame and confusion, and to extort from us the cry, Lord, be merciful to me a sinner!

---

* See Newman, Appendix, pp. 400, 401.

We are here reminded of the saying of Augustine, that grace enables us to *fulfil* the law; which saying is produced by Mr. Newman, (p. 62,) in opposition to Luther's assertion that God's commandments are impossible. It may be worth while to consider this for a moment. As an abstract theoretical proposition, then, it may be true that, with grace, it is possible to fulfil every tittle and iota of the law of God. For, of no one righteous act can it be affirmed that, with the aid of divine grace, it might not have been performed. And of no one sinful act can it be affirmed that, by the aid of divine grace, it might not have been avoided. And yet, every one must see that this sort of possibility is a mere affair of speculation: just as much so, as the dynamical effects, ascertained by the exact theorems of science, but never precisely exemplified in nature. The whole history of mankind proclaims the difficulty of perfect obedience to be such, that, in spite of all the aid vouchsafed to man, the recurrence of the commonest phenomena in the physical world is not more absolutely certain than frequent failures of moral rectitude. Whether perfection be, in itself, possible or not, we are all sure that it never has been, and never will be, exhibited to mortal eyes; quite as sure as we are, that the seasons will be diversified with cloud and sunshine. And thus the question returns upon us, with aggravated force,—if grace makes perfect obedience possible, and yet our obedience is always imperfect, how can that obedience, in any one act of it, be ever acceptable, otherwise than by a process of gracious and compassionate imputation? It is acceptable, Mr. Newman tells us, because it is sprinkled with the atoning blood; which sweetens and purifies it, and imparts to it an acceptable character. But, surely, any act of obedience which needs atonement at all, must have in it something very like a taint of sin. And, it is difficult to understand how the atoning virtue can change the inherent quality of the act itself. So far as we can discern, the atonement can do no more than secure for the act, a more indulgent and favourable estimation, than it would otherwise receive. The holy incense of the altar may overpower the earthly savours which issue from the sacrifice; but can scarcely impart to the sacrifice itself a fragrance which is alien from its nature.

The statements of Mr. Newman on this subject are occasionally such as to involve—we are unwilling to say a contradiction,—but something so enigmatical, that our poor sagacity is often baffled in the attempt to furnish the solution. For instance,—he contends, first, that justification and sanctification are, substantially, the same thing; that they are properties, qualities, and aspects, of one and the same gift: and this statement, he maintains, is entirely warranted by the language of Scripture. He, next, affirms that, viewed relatively to each other, justification *follows* upon sanctification: an assertion which, however, he allows to be true in a *popular* sense, but not in an *exact* sense. And, accordingly, he afterwards declares that justification *tends* to sanctify. The sanctifying power is to justification, what the breath of life is to man. It is the very principle of its vitality. "To quench "it, is as if we stopped a man's breath: it is the death of that "from which it proceeds," (pp. 67, 95.) We are not quite sure that we rightly apprehend the force of this illustration. It would seem strange to say, first, that the vital breath is the source of animation; and then, that the man having thus become a living soul, his nature becomes gifted with a *tendency* to animate and to actuate the frame. First, the breath of life makes the man. Then, the man is identified with his own life. And, lastly, the life is represented as a property, or power, proceeding or originating from the man. The cause is, first, identified with its effect; but, nevertheless, in the end, changes places with it. There appears to us to be a sort of *glamour* in all this, which can hardly furnish a correct representation of the dealings and operations of divine wisdom. We speak, however, with all becoming diffidence; seeing that Mr. Newman toils at the establishment and illustration of his positions with all the earnestness of the most profound and deliberate conviction. He has pursued the subject through many a page of extremely refined and elaborate disquisition. He takes us up into a region, the atmosphere of which is somewhat too highly rarefied and subtilized for our gross organs of respiration. There may, however, be many others, endowed with faculties better adapted to the enterprize: and to them we must, accordingly, commend the adventure.

It appears, from the whole tenor of his work, that Mr. Newman recoils, with something approaching to a positive antipathy, from the thought of a justification *external* to ourselves. He seems to derive but meagre satisfaction from the contemplation of what was done *for* us eighteen hundred years ago; or, of the gracious change of purpose—(we speak after the manner of men)—which prevails in the council-chamber of God, far out of our sight, and beyond the reach of our thoughts. What, then, —is it little that there is, no longer, wrath in heaven? Is it little that atonement has been made, and that the plague has been arrested? Is it little that the mouth of the adversary has been stopped; and that, now, there is none that shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect, so long as they are striving—(though with various success)—to walk after the Spirit?—But, then, Mr. Newman contends that our condition would still be desolate and comfortless, if there were not also something *nigh unto us, in our hearts, and upon our lips.* And is there nothing nigh unto us, and in our hearts? Does he not himself describe in breathing thoughts, and in burning words, the glory and the blessedness of the gift that is in us,—even the sacred presence of the Lord who bought us? And does this gift become dubious, and, comparatively, worthless in his sight, when its efficacy is denoted by the term *sanctification,* and its peculiar province separated, in our thoughts, from the office of absolving grace? True is it, that our justification would, of itself, be an imperfect thing, if it amounted to nothing more than a transitory act of absolution, the virtue of which was momentary, and passed away with the waters of baptism; so that every future lapse or failing should be, as it were, engraven on the rock, beyond the power of the atoning blood to wash away. And still more strange would it be, if God had dealt with us something after the manner in which human laws often deal with pardoned or acquitted felons; if he had first absolved us from guilt, and then, as it were, had turned us loose again upon the world, just as naked and defenceless as before, against its manifold temptations. But He has not dealt thus with us. He says unto us—Behold an amnesty for the past. Behold, too, a mighty gift of power, to uphold your future steps in the path of righteousness and peace. And, lastly, behold,—mercy and goodness are not yet exhausted. The same price which first purchased your forgiveness, shall likewise be accepted as a ransom for your stumblings and back-slidings, while toiling faithfully along the steep and narrow way. And, in the scheme of redemption thus prepared for us, and offered to us, we cannot surely but discern two different compartments; in each of which, though they be closely contiguous and united, a distinct process is, respectively, carried on,—the justifying process, whereby sin is, from time to time, remitted; and the sanctifying process, whereby sin is gradually subdued. And something like this appears to have been in the mind of Augustine, when he said: "In renascentibus remittitur peccatum. In proficientibus minui-" tur. In resurgentibus tollitur."*

We must here conclude what we have room to offer on the import of justification. And we know not how we can better conclude it, than by transferring from Mr. Newman's pages to our own, the following words of Barrow; in the wish, rather than the hope, that they may extinguish this smouldering controversy for ever!

> "To each person sincerely embracing the Gospel, and continuing in stedfast adherence thereto, God doth afford His Holy Spirit as a principle productive of all inward sanctity, and virtuous dispositions in his heart, enabling and quickening him to discharge the conditions of faith and obedience required from him, and undertaken by him, that *which is by some termed*, making a person just, infusion into his soul of righteousness, of grace, of virtuous habits. In the scripture style it is called, 'acting by the Spirit,' 'bestowing the gift of the Holy Ghost,' 'renovation of the Holy Ghost,' 'creation to good works,' 'sanctification by the Spirit,' &c. which phrases denote partly the collation of a principle enabling to perform good works, partly the design of religion tending to that performance. Now all these acts (as by the general conduct of Christians, and according to the sense of the ancient Catholic Church, so) by all considerable parties seeming to dissent, and so earnestly disputing about the point of justification, are acknowledged and ascribed unto God; but with which of them the act of justification is solely or chiefly coincident, whether it signifieth barely some one of them, or extendeth to more of them, or comprehendeth them all, (according to the constant meaning of the word in Scripture,) are questions coming under debate, and so eagerly prosecuted: of which questions, whatever the true resolution be, *it cannot methinks be of so great consequence*, as to cause any great anger or animosity in disputes one toward another, seeing they all conspire in avowing the acts, whatever they be, meant by the word justification, although in other terms, seeing all the dispute is about the precise and adequate notion of the word justification; whence *those* questions might well be waved as unnecessary grounds of contention, and it might suffice to understand the points of doctrine which it relateth to in other terms, laying that aside as ambiguous and litigious."

It now remains for us to consider what is the nature, and what the office, of that Faith, by which, or through which justification is obtained. And here, as the investigation proceeds, we find that faith becomes gradually invested by Mr. Newman with a monopoly as absorbing as that conferred by him on justification. We have already seen that, in his estimate, justification is equivalent to the whole collection of evangelical blessings. And now we perceive that faith is only a comprehensive name for the whole assemblage and family of the Christian graces. This grand result, however, opens upon us, by degrees, in the course of our journeying over a vast extent of laborious and perplexing disquisition; at an early stage of which occurs this question:—" Faith is accept-" able, as having something in it, which unbelief has not. That " something, what is it?" (p. 150.) Now, just let us, for a moment, reverse the question; thus, " Unbelief is offensive, as hav-" ing something in it, which faith has not. That something, what " is it?" To this question, the answer is simple enough. Unbelief is offensive to God, because it has in it a principle of opposition to the authority of God, and of factious resistance to the testimony of God; a temper of self-will, which, rather than surrender one jot or tittle of its lofty independence, will not hesitate to *make God a liar*. Now, faith, (whatever *else* it may have in it,) must evidently involve a principle, or a quality, directly the reverse of that which enters into the very essence of unbelief. And, if so, it surely is no very difficult matter to imagine, that it cannot well be otherwise than acceptable to God. Nothing, of course, is further from our thoughts than the notion, that faith, or any other human quality or act, can ever, in strictness of speech, be *meritoriously* acceptable to the Deity. But faith, considered merely as the opposite of unbelief, must always imply a state of mind, without which it is at least impossible to please God. The voice of what is called natural religion,—nay, the voice of common sense,—tells us as much as this,—that he who comes to God, must believe that He is; and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him: and further, that, in the absence of such belief, all that goes by the name of religion, can be nothing better than mere delusion and hypocrisy. The Apostle, clearly, speaks of this as a self-evident matter,—an undeniable axiom. Faith then, upon the very lowest estimate that can be formed of its excellence, is the seminal and vital principle of every religious sentiment; for, it is that, without which no religious sentiment can exist for a moment. It, therefore, can scarcely seem surprising that it should, likewise, have been selected as eminently worthy to open to us the portals of revealed religion; and, further, that a high and transcendent office should have been graciously assigned to it, throughout the whole economy of the Redeemer's kingdom.

---

* Aug. contrà Jul., lib. vi. c. 16.

These considerations, however, we grievously fear, will afford but scanty satisfaction to Mr. Newman. For he asks, in another place, (p. 300,) "Why must *trust* be a part of the essence of "justifying faith, yet love and obedience external to it?"—Why? —because *trust* is a feeling, or a state of mind scarcely separable, even in thought, from a belief in the truth of the Gospel dispensation. We feel the attempt to divorce them to be a violence done to our nature. The faith of the devils may, possibly, be alleged to the contrary. But there is, in their condition, a dreadful peculiarity; forcible enough to effect this most unnatural separation. The Gospel is not known to them, or propounded to them, as a scheme of mercy. They know, on the contrary, that they are beyond the pale of mercy altogether: and, therefore, they believe and tremble. *Trust* can never enter into their faith; any more than *trust* can enter into the feelings of an atrocious criminal under sentence; although he may be firmly satisfied that the crown has the prerogative of pardon, and the reigning prince an indulgent and compassionate disposition. But it is not thus with them, who receive the overtures of redemption. To them, the Saviour may be considered as speaking in this manner:—"Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy "laden. I demand no past services. I inquire not into past "transgressions. I ask nothing, at this present, but a submissive "reliance on my power and will to save you. And, for the "future, I ask a continuance of that reliance, that the work of "your salvation may be prosperously carried on: a reliance, "which, if cordial and sincere, will assuredly produce obedience, "while it banishes despair."

But, here, we are met, by Mr. Newman, with the question, Why should trust result in obedience? Why should good works be the fruit of a reliance on the revealed mercies of God? Surely, the wonder is that it should ever be otherwise! The natural presumption is, that any religious sentiment or principle will manifest itself in a course of conduct in harmony with that principle. "Can that man possibly believe the Gospel?" is the exclamation which bursts from every sound mind and honest heart, when revolted by gross inconsistencies in the life of one who makes profession of the Gospel. The belief, of which we speak, indeed, from the nature of the case, is widely different from that which men repose in the narratives of history, or the deductions of science. It is different, because it is directed to a very different object. Historical faith, indeed, or faith in the discoveries of philosophy, have each a strong tendency to the production of certain appropriate results. They exert no influence on the moral conduct; but, on the whole, they do exert a mighty influence within their own peculiar sphere. The natural tendency of religious faith, on the contrary, is towards the production of fruit within the domain of morality; and this, for a very plain reason, because it has the God of all righteousness for its object. He that embraces the Gospel, embraces a scheme, the design of which is to atone for sin, and, eventually, to abolish the dominion of sin. His faith, therefore, if it be awake, must hold out a gorgon head before him, whenever he wilfully deviates into the ways of sin. It must haunt and pursue him with a tormenting sense of his own duplicity, and leave him no rest till he makes a vigorous effort to regain the paths of rectitude. His religious faith, it is true, may often fall asleep, and fail to do its office: and so may the prudential faith of the children of this world; and hence it is that both the world and the church are filled with prodigies of incongruity. But still it remains true, that the faith of each, respectively, has a natural tendency to produce the fruits of obedience;—the one, of obedience to the dictates of prudence,—the other, of obedience to the will of God.

That these statements, however, should appear to Mr. Newman unworthy of the dignity of justifying faith, will hardly be surprising, when we find that he considers faith as deriving the powers ascribed to it, from the grace of justification itself! Faith, he assures us, does not precede justification. On the contrary, it is a fruit of the justified state, (pp. 150, 151); "a "supernaturally implanted instinct, developed by religious obe- "dience, and determining the mind to the word of Christ and his "Apostles." (p. 306.) And again, justification precedes faith, *and makes it justifying*. (p. 260.) Moreover, faith, though of later birth than justification, is, nevertheless, the recipient of it: and, accordingly, the whole process of our salvation is described as follows:—"Justification comes through the sacraments,—*is* "*received by faith*,—consists in God's inward presence,—and "*lives* in obedience." (p. 318.) Now, we are not much in the rationalizing habit of rejecting hard sayings, merely because they are hard. On the contrary, we endeavour to keep constantly in mind, that God's ways are not as our ways, nor God's thoughts as our thoughts. Still, we cannot but plainly avow that our capacities are sorely tasked by the above exposition of Mr. Newman's. For, if it be correct, it compels us to hold that a man is justified *by* something, or *through* something, which did not exist, or which did not come into action, previously to the commencement of the justified state; and, further, that justification produces that which is the recipient of justification itself! It is beyond our ability to extricate ourselves from the confusion which comes over us, in contemplating the process here described. And our perplexity is not much relieved by the assertion that "the highest praise of faith before baptism, is, that it "leads to it; and its highest efficacy, after, that it comes from "baptism." (p. 275.) Why—if faith comes *from* baptism, surely it cannot have existed, even in the most imperfect condition, before baptism; and, therefore, could have led to nothing! And yet, that it had some sort of existence before baptism, seems to be admitted by Mr. Newman, for he afterwards allows that faith must be, *substantially*, the same habit of mind, under all circumstances; otherwise it would not be called faith. (p. 278.) So that we must presume his meaning to be, that faith, after all, *does* precede justification; but, that it does not acquire any justifying dignity or power, till the process of justification has commenced; in short that although it is a necessary pre-requisite to justification, it has, in fact, no justifying efficacy but what it derives *from* justification.

We cannot but reverentially hope, that there is something more of directness and simplicity in the divine counsels, than we are able to discover in the views here adopted and expounded by their interpreter! And, it does appear to us, that all this confusion might be avoided, by considering faith to be, as truly a needful antecedent to justification, as baptism by water is; an antecedent ordained of God, and graciously accepted by him, as sufficient for the work whereto it was appointed; namely, first to introduce us into a state of salvation, and subsequently to keep us there. The initial faith may not, indeed, be reckoned worthy to be compared with the same faith as it afterwards appears, when the process of renewal is advancing. It may, then, expand, together with the growth of the spiritual faculties, and gather round itself all other graces. And so, it may become fit for the office of sustaining and continuing those blessings which, even in its callow and unfledged condition, its appointed agency was suffered to procure for us. At first, it was permitted to unlock the treasury of Divine mercy. Afterwards, we may consider it as promoted to the function of guarding and dispensing the treasures there contained. If, indeed, it should slumber at its post, the soul may remain poor, in the midst of measureless abundance; and perchance, alas! the precious possessions (in this respect like earthly riches) may make to themselves wings, and flee away. But, if it should be vigilant, and true to its high office, what tongue can tell the bounteous usury with which the treasures shall be measured out to us!

If it should be said, that any faith which may exist before justification, cannot be pleasing or acceptable to God, the answer must be, that He is, at that period, willing to accept us, according to what we have, and not according to what we have not. This is his merciful and gracious mode of dealing with us. He then counts our faith, imperfect and almost purblind as it may be, for righteousness unto us; though he will count it so no longer, if it does not afterwards work by love, and result in obedience. The initial and introductory faith, indeed, may probably have in it some elements of affection, of hope, and cordial submission to unseen realities. But it is certain that it can have nothing truly and positively meritorious in itself: for, to meritorious dignity it never can advance, even in its most mature and exalted condition. It must, therefore, be regarded, at the beginning, the middle, and the end of its course, as holding its office, solely and entirely because it has been God's sovereign pleasure to place it there. Some sufficient reasons we may, perhaps, be able to discern for its appointment to the function. But we know not enough of the divine purposes to speak confidently as to this. It, accordingly, best becomes us to ascribe the whole, from first to last, to God's unsearchable benignity and wisdom.

This view of the subject appears to us to derive very strong confirmation from an ancient maxim of the Church, adverted to by Mr. Newman, that the faith of catechumens, dying before baptism, might avail for their reception into the kingdom of heaven: a notion which could scarcely have prevailed, if the Church ascribed to initial faith no higher virtue than that which is attributed to it by Mr. Newman. If, however, the catechumen had lived, and said,—I am conscious of having faith, and therefore see no need of baptism,—doubtless the Church would have held him for an heathen and a publican. The very refusal to submit to the express ordinance of Christ, would, of itself, have been sufficient to negative his claim to the character of a believer. And similar to this would have been the case of St. Paul himself (produced by Mr. Newman in support of his own views), if St. Paul had declined the injunction of Ananias. The faith of St. Paul—it is here alleged—must have been immediately justifying, if ever faith was: and yet, he must be baptized, and wash away his sins. (p. 265.) Undoubtedly he must! "Thy "faith hath made thee whole," was the language of our Lord to those who had believed in his power to heal them. But such would not have been his language, if the applicants had refused to do, or to attempt, whatever he commanded, as preliminary to their reception of the benefit. And thus it was with the apostle. Baptism was the appointed entrance into the justified state. But still it is true that his faith justified him. It is as if God said to all who come unto him: "Dost thou believe in the riches con-

" tained in my house? If thou dost, then take the key and un-
" lock the gate."

Nothing can be more certainly true than what Mr. Newman himself has said—" What faith was, in the days of the Son of " Man, for temporal blessings, surely it is, now, under the minis- " tration of the Spirit, for heavenly blessings," (p. 268): and nothing, as it seems to us, can well be more destructive of his own position! For, assuredly, in the days of the Son of Man, the *faith* always preceded the *blessing*. " If thou canst believe—all " things are possible to them that believe:" such was the language of the Son of Man, before he stretched out a hand, or spake a word, for the relief of the sufferer. And this is a type of the proceeding by which our souls are delivered from their moral distempers and infirmities.

But then we are told that " nothing is said of faith, before " baptism, which is not said of repentance, or of restitution." (p. 275). Well—but still it may be asked, is justification ever connected with repentance, at any stage of the Christian course, *as* it is connected with faith? If it had been ever said that we are justified *by* repentance, or *through* repentance, should we not have concluded that repentance must have preceded justification—that it must have been an effective antecedent to baptism—that, in short, it was to do for us all that faith is now said to do? Besides—it is not very easy to imagine faith and repentance to be disjoined from each other. The believing sufferer would hardly apply to the Son of Man for health, if he were not oppressed with a sense of his diseases and infirmities. And, in the same manner, the believing sinner would never apply to the Great Physician of the soul, if he did not feel weary and heavy-laden with the weight of his transgressions. The faith which entitles a man to ask for baptism, must, from the nature of the case, be the faith of a penitent. People seldom ask for what they do not want, whatever may be their reliance on the kindness or the power of a benefactor. The case is simply this: A man is afflicted with the consciousness of infirmity and guilt. He *believes* that a fountain has been opened for sin and for uncleanness. And, in virtue of his belief, he is allowed to have access to the waters.

Mr. Newman, however, frequently reminds us that we *live* by faith. Unquestionably we do. We begin to live by it, and we continue to live by it. He, also, admonishes us that we *stand* by faith: and he asks, where was it ever said that we are to *rise up* by faith? We think we have read of something very like it! " Paul, stedfastly beholding the cripple, and perceiving that he " had faith to be healed, said with a loud voice, stand upright on " thy feet." (Acts, xiv. 9, 10.) And, Paul was here speaking in the spirit and power of the Son of Man; in whose days, as Mr. Newman has justly observed, what faith did for the mortal bodies of men, was analogous to that which, afterwards, it was to do for their immortal souls. But, again,—we are apprized, that "the reception of grace is the prerogative of faith," (p. 270,)—a proposition altogether undeniable, if broadly and comprehensively understood. By faith, we receive the initial grace or gift of justification: and, by faith, we continue to receive, from time to time, the benefits of justification, even to our life's end. Once more—"faith is the tenure on which we enjoy the gifts which Christ has merited for us." (p. 280.) Even so it is: and under that same tenure it is, that we first enter upon the enjoyment. Lastly—"faith heralds forth the grace of God." (p. 279.) Indisputably, it does so. And this office, we contend, belongs to it from the very first. How can the grace of God be more fitly heralded, than by an open renunciation of human desert? And does not the voice of faith proclaim this renunciation, when it craves admittance to a covenant, which, throughout, is established on the ground of God's free mercy? It is true that, when once admitted, the eye of faith may gradually become steadier and brighter, as the moral sensibility becomes more keen,—and the view of God's attributes more distinct and overpowering,—and the extent of God's mercies more perfectly revealed. The principle of faith, or trust, will then be more enlightened, more vivid, more deeply affectionate. The renunciation of self will grow constantly more passionate. The reliance on the blessed gift of an indwelling Saviour will perpetually be gaining intensity and power. In a word, faith will become more exalted and refined, and more fit for the lofty function to which it is promoted. The "recipient of grace" will daily be increasing in capacity. Or (to return to Mr. Newman's figure), the herald of grace will acquire a faculty of utterance, more and more worthy of its high and glorious theme. And, in all this, we can see nothing at variance with the truth, that the first dawnings of faith itself, must be ascribed to the power of God: for, to Him we must all write ourselves debtors for every movement of the heart or spirit, which may have a tendency to good. And, to those who may be conscious of any such movement, it may always be said,—who made thee to differ?—what hast thou, which thou hast not received? The Gospel, undoubtedly, will be preached in vain to the heathen, if He does not open their hearts. And, if there be some who believe, and some who believe not, nothing remains for us, but to ascribe the difference to God's inscrutable election. But, be the origin of faith what it may, to faith is undoubtedly assigned the office of opening the kingdom of heaven to believers: that kingdom into which the sacrament of regeneration is the ordained and lawful entrance.

That such was the view of those who framed our liturgy, appears to us beyond all dispute. In the office for baptism of adults, the preliminary exhortation contains these words;—"Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that He will favourably receive these present persons, truly repenting and coming unto him by faith; that He will grant them remission of their sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost; that He will give them the blessing of eternal life, and make them partakers of His everlasting kingdom." The language of the concluding address is in harmony with the exhortation;—"As for you, who have now, by baptism, put on Christ, it is your part and duty also, by being made the children of God and of the light, by faith in Jesus Christ, to walk answerably to your Christian calling, and as becometh the children of light." This language may, doubtless, be resolutely explained away; and the faith to which it adverts, may be degraded into a mere condition, a *sine quâ non;* or, negatively, into the mere absence of positive disqualification. But, be it what it may, it is evidently something which is honoured by great and precious promises; something, too, (by Mr. Newman's own concession), which indicates a habit, or a state of mind, the same in kind, if not the same in degree, with that which follows upon baptism, and perpetuates the blessing. It may not, indeed, be, then, the same vigorous and lively principle which it may afterwards become, when the gift of the Spirit has been actually bestowed. But, still, it is the same principle in a rudimental state and form. It is something which is essential to all religion; and which, by its very nature, is fitted to be the nucleus and germ of all spiritual excellence. And, for this reason, we may humbly and reverentially presume, it has been so highly favoured by Him to whom all religion looks.

So much, for the baptism of adults. The case of infants, indeed, bears a different aspect. And, if we had been left, solely, to the guidance of our own judgment, we might, *perhaps*, have been induced to think, that the whole spirit and design of the Gospel would have been better consulted, and more consistently followed out, by leaving our children in the state of catechumens, until they should be of age to make a profession of faith for themselves. The Church, however, has interpreted the mind of the Spirit, by her immemorial practice. On the one hand, she accepted the faith of the catechumen, who might chance to die before baptism could be administered. And, on the other hand, she has always received into her bosom those who are too young for repentance or belief, and has accepted a vicarious profession of faith, on their behalf: even as our blessed Lord himself was pleased to heal the helpless paralytic, when he saw the faith of those who brought him to be healed. But, even in so doing, she manifestly recognizes the *general* principle, that belief is a necessary antecedent; and declares that two things are properly requisite in them that are *to be* baptized,—" repentance, whereby " they forsake sin; and faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the " promises of God."

The twelfth of Mr. Newman's lectures is devoted to a comparison of St. Paul and St. James. We really have no space for the hitherto interminable controversy which has arisen out of their *apparently* conflicting averments. Our own impressions, respecting this debateable matter, will be best conveyed by putting an imaginary case. Let us, then, suppose a moral teacher, or monitor, to be in conference with a man of lofty pretensions, and of very mean performances. We may easily conceive that he might address his slippery and doubleminded hearer, in the following manner:—" Do not talk to me of your benevolent senti-" ments, and the tenderness of your heart. Show me the hungry " that you have helped to feed, the naked that you have helped " to clothe, the afflicted that you have helped to console. Then, " and not till then, will it be credible, that you have any part or " lot in the blessedness which is promised to the merciful."—Or, again,—" Do not tell me of your penitential prostration of heart. " Let me see the works that are meet for repentance. Let me " see the reformation of your life, the abandonment of your vices, " the steady pursuit of all that is honest and lovely and of good " report. For, assuredly, nothing short of this will be accepted " or endured by Him, whose delight it is to dwell in the hearts " of the lowly and the contrite." Or, once more,—" Do not talk " to me of your trust in the mercies of God, and the merits of your " Redeemer. The mercies of God are outraged, and the merits " of the Redeemer horribly abused, when the triumphs of faith " are proclaimed by unrighteous lips. The faith of Abraham, " and the Patriarchs, manifested itself in a course of hard obedi-" ence. And, when you conform yourself to their example, and " shew forth your faith by deeds which savour of rectitude and " holiness, then may you stand justified in the sight of God and " man. The faith which has no works to show, is a cold, lifeless, " barren thing. It is unworthy of the name of faith. The faith " which justifies, is capable of action, and ready for action. It " can never leave the soul in a state of moral apathy; for its eye " is directed towards Him who loveth righteousness and hateth " iniquity. Its meditations are upon that dreadful sacrifice, by " which alone His justice and His mercy could be reconciled.

" The very things with which it is most conversant, speak, aw-
" fully and sternly, of the hatefulness of sin. He, therefore, who
" dares to affirm that he is walking by faith, while he is not care-
" ful to walk in the ways of obedience, stands manifestly convicted
" as a hypocrite." Now this, as it appears to us, is precisely the spirit of the Apostle's warm and artless remonstrance with them that boasted of their faith. And, most assuredly he seems utterly unconscious of any discrepancy between his own admonition, and the doctrine of St. Paul: for, like St. Paul, he illustrates his positions by reference to the case of Abraham. It is irresistibly obvious, however, that his rebuke was directed against persons who had shamefully perverted and abused the doctrine of his brother Apostle. St. Paul had told the Jews that they could never be justified by the works of the law; that is, by their own doings under the law; and this, for the simple reason, that no man had ever perfectly obeyed the law, or ever would. They must therefore resort, with entire and unreserved confidence, to another and better dispensation. And, their faith in that dispensation would justify and save them; seeing that their faith was the only thing required for their introduction to the blessings of God's new Covenant; the only thing, too, which could, instrumentally, secure them in the enjoyment of those blessings. St. James, on the other hand, protests against the notion that the faith inculcated by St. Paul, was a principle which left men at liberty to sin, in order that grace might abound. And accordingly, he declares that Christian men cannot be saved by faith alone, without works; that is, by a faith without signs of life. They must show forth their faith by their works. Nay—they must be justified by works,—in other words, by faith in action.

According to the foregoing view of the matter, it may, in a very safe and warrantable sense, be affirmed that the Christian is justified by his strivings after integrity of life; and this, without the slightest invasion of the prerogative of faith, as the sole justifying qualification. It might be very properly maintained that fidelity and allegiance are the qualities which alone can recommend a man to the distinguished favour of his sovereign; and yet it might, with equal propriety, be affirmed, in the same breath, that the way to honour and reward is through a course of brave and steady service. In this respect, faith resembles loyalty. It must be prepared to labour, if it would earn its crown: although the crown may be far too precious for any personal desert to claim. And, to shrink from this statement, is to betray a most unworthy prostration of mind before the authority of that imperious edict, which declares that justification by faith, and by faith only, is the article of a standing or a falling Church. This is just one of those sayings, in which the whole spirit of a revolution is frequently embodied. Such maxims, even when they express a truth, are pretty sure to do the work of error; for they present the truth under one aspect only; and, upon that one aspect, they fix exclusively the attention of the beholder; so that, when any other *phase* is exhibited, it wears the appearance of falsehood and delusion. We conceive it to be highly probable, that, if Christendom had been afflicted for centuries by the Antinomian perversion, instead of the Romish superstitions and corruptions, justification by works would have been set up, as the test, whereby to ascertain the Church's stability or decline.

In the midst of all the darkness that has gathered round this question, one thing, at least, is clear and bright: a day will come, when men shall be judged according to their works; and, when their works shall be judged according to their motives. And, of all the motives by which men can be impelled, what motive can be imagined so powerful, as an habitual persuasion that the perfections of the Deity are truly revealed to us in the Gospel Dispensation? In that day, we shall be dealt with, according to what we shall be found *to be;* and so, it may truly be said, that the Christian will then stand justified by his faith; seeing that faith is the only habit of mind in which acceptable works can be performed by him. But, we shall also be dealt with, according to what we *have done.* And so, it may be likewise said that, by our works shall we be justified, and by our works shall we be condemned.

A good deal of the perplexity by which the subject has been overwhelmed seems to have arisen from the difficulty of furnishing a definition of justifying faith, sufficiently precise to satisfy a philosophical inquirer. What—it may be asked—is this mighty principle, which is said to be so fruitful in wonders? And, since it might be no easy matter to frame such an answer to this question, as might be altogether safe from captious objections, divines have, naturally enough, been often tempted to describe faith, by an appeal to its effects; just as the metaphysicians are compelled to define substances by an enumeration of their respective qualities or accidents. We, accordingly, find that Mr. Newman himself is content to avow that, after all,—" We know not " what faith is, in itself; we know it only in its results. Re- " latively to us, it exists *only* in its results," (p. 337.) And, in the same spirit, our Article compares it to a tree, the quality of which is to be known by its fruits. We may be mistaken in our endeavours to define or to describe the peculiar vegetative principle of the plant. But we can scarcely be mistaken in our estimate of the produce. Now,—(to borrow the language and illustration of Dr. Hey):—

> "It will seldom happen, that we need go deeper than this; yet, to say the truth, we may sometimes be driven, by obstinate cavilling, to descend one step farther. If a man will not be contented with the rational account now given, but will still persist in saying, you take your *idea* of faith, not from *faith itself*, but from some *effects* of what you describe and define; the answer *then* must be, *all active principles*, such is the confined knowledge of man, may, in some cases, oblige us to have recourse to their *effects*, merely to describe or define them.—What is *gunpowder?* at first we only, in answer, define gunpowder by its *ingredients*; nitre, with a little sulphur and charcoal: this will generally serve to describe, or define, gunpowder. But suppose you try this composition, and it makes no *explosion?*—then you say, immediately, this is not *right* gunpowder: what? did it not answer to your definition? I do not care how it was mixed, says a plain man, but I am sure, that it is not right gunpowder, which will not go off when you touch it with fire. And some inquisitive spectators might go farther, and say, perhaps the *nitre* was not *right* nitre, nor the *sulphur* right sulphur, &c. and then our difficulties multiply upon us. Here is, no doubt, a perplexity; we have not determinate ideas; but yet the perplexity is one, under which we should make ourselves very *easy*, as a matter of speculation; and for practice, we should contrive the best *methods* we could, to *cure* our gunpowder; but we should never rest contented till it had its usual *effects*. Nor is there any good reason why perplexity should occasion greater uneasiness, if we were obliged to quit our definition of faith, and say, this is not *right* faith, because it has not the right *effects* of faith."—vol. iii. p. 353.

If the reader is not weary of illustrations, we would venture on one more.—A man afflicted with a mortal disease resorts to a physician endowed with supernatural gifts of healing, who declares that a full reliance on his power and good will is indispensably requisite for the cure. The sufferer protests that he has this feeling. The word is spoken; and the man is healed. But, the physician then adds,—"The danger is now over. The "venom of the plague is gone. Nevertheless, the disorder has "left you miserably weak. Your perfect establishment in health "and strength will be a work of time. There still must be care "and vigilance. There must be air, and exercise, and regularity. "Your constitution will resent neglect or violence: and, if these "should be long continued, your relapse may probably be fatal. "You declared your entire confidence in me, previously to your "cure. You must, now, show the sincerity and strength of that "reliance, by strictly following my directions. If your faith "should fail so to manifest itself, you are lost." Now, it is true that, in a case like this, the patient would be healed, and finally set up, entirely by the power and goodness of the physician. And yet it might, also, be truly said that he was preserved solely by his faith; seeing that his faith was the one thing needful to call the power of the physician into action. And, lastly, it might be affirmed, without the slightest inconsistency, that the man was carried through by his own obedience to orders; that obedience being the result of his submissive reliance on the consummate wisdom and benignity of his preserver. And is it not even thus with our spiritual malady, and our deliverance from it? The Christian is saved entirely by the power and benevolence of the Great Physician. He is, also, instrumentally, saved by the faith which commended him to the good offices of his gracious benefactor. And yet, without any contradiction, it may further be asserted, that he is finally saved by his *faithful* adherence to the holy regimen and discipline, which the same Physician has prescribed.

We have left ourselves but small space for remark on the volume of Mr. Faber. We protest, however, against the suspicion that our brevity is an indication of scanty respect for his labours. His services to the cause of the Catholic verity are notorious and manifold. They are such as must always entitle him to an honourable rank in the goodly company of Anglican divines. But his appeal to Catholic antiquity, for the settlement of the questions now before us, appears to us considerably less satisfactory than those, by which he has aided to confirm our faith in the Trinity, and to fix the true doctrine of election. He has produced, indeed, a copious series of quotations from seventeen of the Fathers, beginning with Clement of Rome, and ending with Bernard of Clairvaux; for the purpose of establishing the doctrine of *forensic* justification, in opposition to the Romish doctrine of righteousness inherent and infused. But, in the first place, we must confess that certain of these passages appear to us to be not altogether conclusive of the matter in debate. And, secondly, —if we are to judge by the vast variety of citations which the agitation of this question has called up from time to time—it would be no easy matter to ascertain, with entire distinctness and precision, the vein of thought which runs through this region of the primitive theology. Our *impression* is, that the Romanist and the Protestant might assail each other with sayings and sentences from the Fathers, to the end of time, without much prospect of a decisive victory on either side. To our ears, their trumpet seems, for the most part, to render an uncertain sound. And the reason for this is intelligible enough. They did not use the trumpet, to blow upon it certain *points of war*. In their days no formal controversy had arisen upon the subject, at all similar to that by which Christendom was agitated in the 16th century. And, therefore, they frequently expressed themselves in a manner comparatively artless and untechnical. Relative to one matter, indeed, they were clear and decided,—that we are debtors for every spiritual blessing to the free grace and unbought mercy of God. But, as Barrow observes, " they did consider *distinctly* " no such point as justification; looking upon that word as used " in Scripture, for the expression of points *more* clearly expressed " in other terms. Wherefore, they do not make much use of the " word, as some divines now do."* So that we almost despair of seeing the question brought speedily to issue by an appeal to their testimony.

We are under the necessity of leaving our readers to examine the authorities brought forward by Mr. Faber, and to estimate for themselves the weight of those authorities. Perhaps the very earliest of them,—that of Clement,—is among the strongest that can be produced. And yet the value of his testimony depends chiefly upon the sense we are to attach to the words, *οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως.* Now Mr. Faber contends that, by " works which we did in holiness of heart," we must, indisputably, understand works performed after the infusion of holiness into the heart by the gracious Spirit; which works are, yet, carefully shut out by Clement from the office of justifying. And such undoubtedly *may* have been the meaning of the writer. But it is very far from being certain that such *was* his meaning. For, first, " works done in holiness of heart," may be nothing more than a periphrastic form of expression, denoting holy works, or works done with pious intent; and indicating nothing determinate respecting the state or condition in which the works are done. Besides, the averment of the father may amount to no more than this, that we are not justified by holy works,—seeing that we have no such performances to show. And, further, Mr. Newman has produced certain other expressions from the very same writer, which seem pretty nearly to neutralize the force of that passage upon which Mr. Faber so confidently relies. (Newm. Append. p. 436, &c.)

After all, however, Mr. Faber is to be regarded rather as the antagonist of Alexander Knox, than of Mr. Newman. In grappling with Knox, he evidently considers himself as, in effect, grappling with the Tridentine Divines; whose system of an inherent righteousness,—of a moral quality infused into the soul,—Knox endeavoured to revive; though with an anxious disclaimer of all righteousness truly and formally meritorious. Now

---

* Barrow, Sermon on Justification.

Mr. Newman, as we have seen, contends for no infusion of a moral quality. What he does contend for, is, the inward presence of Christ in the soul, as the formal cause of our *justification;* under which term he comprises all the gifts and blessings of the renovated state: not only the remission of sins, but also, every thing which is usually contemplated by those, who speak in the loftiest and most vivid terms of the righteousness of *sanctification.* And,—after the most careful thought that we are capable of giving to the subject,—the conviction still returns upon us, that, as between him and Mr. Faber, the dispute will be found to resolve itself principally into a question respecting the fit application of a word. At all events, we do ardently hope, for the honour of our common Christianity, that we shall hear nothing, from any quarter, that sounds like fierce denunciation against Mr. Newman, as an abettor of Popery, and a traitor to the Reformation! We earnestly deprecate all such disgraceful eruptions of ferocious panic. If there be any, who should be smitten with alarm, lest the doctrine of meritorious righteousness should, here, be creeping back among us, in disguise,—let them give a patient and candid hearing to the following words: and then let them ask themselves whether they can find in Mr. Newman's teaching, any reasonable cause to fear the revival of that awful perversion:

"I say, the view of justification taken by Romanists and by a school of divines among ourselves, tends to fix the mind on self, not on Christ, whereas that which I have advocated as Scriptural and Catholic, buries self in the absorbing vision of a present, an indwelling God. And as so doing, it is a more awakening and fearful doctrine even, than that mode of teaching, which insists mainly and directly on our responsibilities and duties. For to what does it point as the great and immediate condition of justification? to faith and holiness of our own? or, on the other hand, to the mere title of righteousness, which cannot be literally approached or profaned by us? no,—but to the glorious Shekinah of the Word Incarnate, as to the true wedding garment in which the soul must be dressed. Does not such a view far increase, instead of diminishing our responsibilities? does it not make us more watchful and more obedient, while it comforts and transports us? Surely it takes our minds off ourselves in order to fill us with triumph, awe, and godly fear at what we are and what we hold within us. When are we the more likely to dread sinning, when we know merely we ought to dread it, or when we see the exceeding peril of it? When are we the more likely to keep awake and be sober, when we have a present treasure now to lose, or a distant reward to gain? Is it not more dreadful, when evil thoughts assail us, more elevating and ennobling in affliction, more kindling in danger and hardship, to reflect (if the words may be said), that we bear God within us, as the Martyr Ignatius expresses it, that He is grieved by us, or suffers with us according as we carry or renounce His Cross,—

I say has not this thought more of persuasiveness in it to do and suffer for Him, than the views of doctrine which have spread among us ? is it not more constraining than that which considers that the Gospel comes to us in name, not in power; deeper, and more sacred than a second, which makes its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and trade; more glowing than a third, which depresses it almost to the chill temperature of natural religion."—pp. 220, 221.

We cannot close our notice of Mr. Newman's volume without soliciting the attention of the reader to the following noble and elevating passage. The extract is somewhat of the longest. But we scruple not to insert it: for,—(whatever may be the variety of opinion respecting the general merit or demerit of Mr. Newman's theological statements),—this extract cannot fail to show that his heart, and all his faculties, are thoroughly pervaded by the spirit of apostolic piety:

"The Gospel, then, is specially the system of faith and 'the law of faith,' and its obedience is the 'obedience of faith,' and its justification is 'by faith,' and it is a 'power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,' as contrasted to all religious systems which have gone before and come after, even those in which God has spoken. For at the time of its first preaching, the Jews went by sight and the Gentiles by reason; both might believe, but on a belief resolvable into sight or reason, neither went simply by faith. The Greeks sought after 'wisdom,' some original and recondite philosophy, which might serve as an 'evidence' or ground of proof for 'things not seen.' The Jews, on the other hand, 'required a sign,' some sensible display of God's power, a thing of sight and touch, which might be 'the substance,' the earnest and security 'of things hoped for.' They wanted some carnal and immediate good, as 'the praise of men;' for this they did their alms, fasted, and prayed, not looking on to witnesses unseen, but for an earthly reward; or, if they wrought for God, it was in a grudging, calculating way, as if to make their services go as far as possible, resting in them as ends, and suspicious of God as of a hard or unjust Master. Such was the state of the world, when it pleased Almighty God, in furtherance of His plan of mercy, to throw men's minds upon the next world without any other direct medium of evidence than the word of man claiming to be His; to change the face of the world by what the world called 'the foolishness of preaching' and the unreasoning zeal and obstinacy of faith, using a principle in truth's behalf which in the world's evil history has ever been the spring of great events and strange achievements. Faith, which in the natural man has manifested itself in the fearful energy of superstition and fanaticism, is in the Gospel grafted on the love of God, and made to mould the heart of man into His image.

"The Apostles then proceeded thus:—they did not rest their cause on argument; they did not appeal to eloquence, wisdom, or reputation; nay, nor did they make miracles necessary to the enforcement of their claims. They did not resolve faith into sight or reason; they contrasted it with both, and bade their hearers believe, sometimes in spite, sometimes in default, sometimes in aid of sight and reason. They exhorted them to make trial of the Gospel, since they would find their account in so doing. And of their hearers 'some believed the things which were spoken, some believed not.' Those believed whose hearts were 'opened,' who were 'ordained to eternal life;' those did not whose hearts were hardened. This was the awful exhibition of which the Apostles and their fellow workers were witnesses; for faith, as a principle of knowledge, cannot be analyzed or made intelligible to man, but is the secret, inexplicable, spontaneous movement of the mind (however arising), towards the external word,—a movement not to the exclusion of sight and reason, for the miracles appeal to both, nor of experience, for all who venture for Christ receive daily returns of good in confirmation of their choice, but independent of sight or reason before, or of experience after. The Apostles appealed to their hearts, and, according to their hearts, so they answered them. They appealed to their secret belief in a superintending providence, in their hopes and fears thence resulting; and they professed to reveal to them the nature, personality, attributes, will, and works of Him "whom they ignorantly worshipped." They came as commissioned from Him, and declared that mankind was a sinful and outcast race,—that sin was a misery,—that the world was a snare,—that life was a shadow,—that God was everlasting,—that His Law was holy and true, and its sanctions certain and terrible;—that He also was all merciful,—that He had appointed a Mediator between Him and them, who had removed all obstacles, and was desirous to restore them, and that He had sent them to explain how. They said that Mediator had come and gone; but had left behind Him what was to be His representative till the end of all things, His mystical Body, the Church, in joining which lay the salvation of the world. Thus they preached, and thus they prevailed, using persuasives of every kind as they were given them, but resting at bottom on a principle higher than the senses or the reason. They used many arguments, but as outward forms of something beyond argument. They appealed to the miracles they wrought, as sufficient signs of their power, and assuredly divine, in spite of those which other systems could show or pretended. They expostulated with the better sort on the ground of their instinctive longings and dim visions of something greater than the world. They awed and overcame the wayward, by the secret influence of what remained of heaven in them, and the involuntary homage paid by such to any more complete realizing of it in others. They asked the more generous-minded whether it was not worth while to risk something on the chance of augmenting and perfecting those precious elements of good which their hearts still held; and they could not hide what they cared not to 'glory in,' their own disinterested sufferings, their high deeds, and their sanctity of life. They won over the affectionate and gentle by the beauty of holiness, and the embodied mercies of Christ as seen in their ministrations and ordinances. Thus they spread their nets for disciples, and caught thousands at a cast; thus they roused and inflamed their hearers into enthusiasm, till 'the Kingdom of Heaven suffered violence, and the violent took it by force.' And when these had entered it, many, doubtless, would wax cold in love, and fall away; for many have entered only on impulse; many, with Simon Magus, on wonder or curiosity; many from a mere argumentative belief, which leads as readily into heresy as into the Truth. But still, those who had the seed of God within them, would become neither offences in the Church, nor apostates, nor heretics; but would find day by day, as love increased, increasing experience that what they had ventured boldly amid conflicting evidence, of sight against sight, and reason against reason, with some things for it, and many things against it, they had ventured well. The examples of meekness, cheerfulness, contentment, silent endurance, private self-denial, fortitude, brotherly love, perseverance in well doing, which would from time to time meet them in their new kingdom,—the sublimity and harmony of the Church's doctrine,—the touching and subduing beauty of her services and appointments,—their consciousness of her virtue, divinely conveyed, upon themselves in subduing, purifying, changing them,—the bountifulness of her alms-giving,—her power, weak as she was and despised, over the statesmen and philosophers of the world,—her consistent and steady aggression upon it, moving forward in spite of it on all sides at once, like the wheels in the Prophet's vision, and this contrasted to the ephemeral and variable outbreaks of sectarianism,—the unanimity and intimacy existing between her widely separated branches,—the mutual sympathy and correspondence of men of hostile nations and foreign languages,—the simplicity of her ascetics, the gravity of her Bishops, the awful glory shed around her Martyrs, and the mysterious and recurring traces of miraculous agency here and there, once and again, according as the Spirit willed,—these and the like persuasives acted on them day by day, turning the whisper of their hearts into an habitual conviction, and establishing in the reason what had been begun in the will. And thus has the Church been upheld ever since, by an appeal to the people,—to the necessities of human nature, the anxieties of conscience, and the instincts of purity; forcing upon kings a sufferance or protection which they fain would dispense with, and upon philosophy a grudging submission and a reserved and limited recognition.

"Such was the triumph of Faith, spreading like a leaven through the thoughts, words, and works of men, till the whole was leavened. It did not affect the substance of religion; it left unaltered both its external developements and its inward character; but it gave strength and direction to its lineaments. The sacrifice of prayer and praise, and the service of an obedient heart and life, remained as essential as before; but it has infused a principle of growth. It has converted grovelling essays into high aspirings—partial glimpses into calm contemplation,—niggard payments into generous self-devotion. It enjoined the law of love for retaliation; it put pain above enjoyment; it supplanted polygamy by the celibate; it honoured poverty before affluence, the communion of saints before the civil power, the next world before this. It made the Christian independent of all men and all things, except of Christ; and provided for a deeper humility, while it abounded in peace and joy."—p. 306—313.

Art. IV.—*Memoir of the Rev. H. Martyn.* By the Rev. John Sargent, late Rector of Lavington. Sussex. Tenth edition. 1830.

2. *Journals and Letters of the Rev. H. Martyn.* Edited by Rev. S. Wilberforce, Rector of Brighstone. 1837.

We feel it necessary to give some explanation of our prefixing to this article the title of the Memoir of the Rev. H. Martyn, a book already so well known, and so often made the subject of review. Of its deeply affecting character, and its high excellence as a composition, no other witness is needed than the remarkable sale of ten editions. Well known as the memoir is already, we have nevertheless thought it right to bring it again before our readers, in the new relation it occupies to the mass of Mr. Martyn's private journals and correspondence, in which are letters on the subject of his last and greatest trial, now edited for the first time. The two works are in many ways necessary to each other. The Memoir gives to the Journals, which are unavoidably broken and disconnected, a definite outline, and continuity; and the Journals supply to the Memoir a complement of the most private and interesting matter, which could not by any means be wrought into it, without breaking the thread of the narration. Many large and valuable passages, already published in the Memoir, are omitted in the later publication, and the reader is referred for them to the earlier. We may, therefore, regard them as integral parts of one very extended and minute piece of biography.

High as Mr. Martyn's name has ever stood, the portion of his journals and correspondence contained in the second volume have raised him in our estimation to a still higher place. In the Memoir we see, as it were at a glance, the whole earthly transit of a most holy, humble, self-renouncing servant of God; in the Journals we are admitted into the full privacy of his inmost conflict. Every passage of his warfare expands out of proportion with the beautiful outline, so admirably and unerringly kept in the original Memoir, as the near observation of objects deranges the keeping of a remoter view, while they severally become in turn sufficient to occupy the whole field of sight. In this way, we have found the several features of Mr. Martyn's character grow upon us, with a kind of ever-varying aspect presenting new difficulties, trials and disappointments, sometimes operating singly, sometimes in combination, and ever resulting in a full and well-earned mastery. But before we make any remarks in detail upon the character of Mr. Martyn as now exhibited to us, it will be right to state very shortly the outline of his life.

He was born at Truro in 1781, and received his early education at the grammar school in that town. In 1797, he commenced his residence at St. John's College, Cambridge. In the year 1801 he took his degree, attaining at the same time the highest academical honour, that of senior wrangler. In the same year, he made the resolution of dedicating himself to the work of a missionary; and in 1803, he received deacon's orders. Soon after this, he was appointed, by the East India Company, to a chaplaincy in India, and, having been admitted to the priesthood in the year 1805, he sailed, on the 17th of July, for India. The ship reached Calcutta in April, 1806. Mr. Martyn's first station was at Dinapore: in 1809, he was removed to Cawnpore: from thence he went, in the year 1811, to Shiraz, for the purpose of completing a translation of the New Testament in the Persian language. After a severe and dangerous illness at Tebriz, he resolved to return, by way of Constantinople, to England. He reached no further than Tocat, and there died, Oct. 16, 1812, in the thirty-second year of his age.

Now if we should attempt a delineation of Mr. Martyn's character, of his high and cultivated intellectual powers, of the stern subjection in which he held the faculties of the pure intellect to the supremacy of the moral sense, by how sharp a discipline the particular affections of his mind were reined in at the bidding of a conscience rendered severe and sensitive by the mingled habits of yearning aspiration, and of deep abasement;—and, besides all this, with how warm and ready a flow of natural affection he applied himself at one time to the discharge of the lowliest pastoral care, and at another to the offices of brotherly attachment; —if we should attempt to delineate a character of such variety and singular excellence, we must write, not a review, but a memoir.

Holding ourselves, therefore, discharged, by the necessity of the case, from the suspicion of slighting so bright an example by a cursory notice, we shall attempt no more than to point out what seem to us the prominent features of Mr. Martyn's character. And these appear to be intense habitual devotion, and an absolute dedication of himself to the service of our Heavenly Master.

Of his intense habits of devotion the two volumes of his Journals bear one unbroken testimony. It would appear that his early life was both amiable and exemplary, but exhibited no energetic signs of a deeper seriousness. The death of his father in 1800, was, it seems, the turning point of his character, and the occasion of his first more defined religious impressions. From that time, the substance of religion became the matter of his most attentive thoughts. He commenced his journals about the year 1802, of which habit he has recorded the following account.

> "I am convinced that Christian experience in general is not a delusion. Whether mine is or not will be seen at the last day. My object in making this Journal is to accustom myself to self-examination, to give my experience a visible form so as to leave an impression on the memory, and so to improve my soul in holiness: for the review of such a lasting testimony, will serve the double end of conviction and consolation. I pretend not to record all that I remember, and that not on account of its minuteness, for nothing is strictly so, but because in some cases it would be improper to commit it to paper. I desire to collect the *habit* of my mind, to discover my besetting sins, the occasion of calling them forth, and the considerations, by which I have been at any time stirred up to duty. May God, in his mercy, save me from the delusions of my deceitful heart, and pardon the indifference with which I speak and think of sin, and of this record, which may be of everlasting importance to my soul."*

From this time we find a record of his daily life, of actions and words, of temptations and falls, of purposes half formed, and faults half consented in, of feelings, and very thoughts, and even of their alternations, and transitory forms, kept with a scrutiny so close and unsparing, that we can liken it to nothing but the finest observation of an ever-varying thermometer. We are amazed at the precision with which he seemed to fix and register the most fleeting imaginations. It is certainly a sufficient proof of his sincerity in saying that in self-examination nothing is strictly *minute*. The whole aspect of the Journals, especially the earlier part, reminds us of the following remarkable passage:

> "The intellectual heart, the spirit and soul of man, is the fountain and source of all action. This is that which understands and wills, loves and hates. Here are all the springs and powers of life and motion; here is the last resort of all outward impressions, and from this central point are derived all the lines of action and motion, even as all the arteries and veins are from the natural heart, which it diffuses and disperses throughout the body, and has its pulses in every part. If, therefore, this general spring-head be not kept pure and clean, how can the streams run clear? And upon this, was grounded that signal advice of the wise man, Prov. iv. 23, 'Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life.' Parallel to which I find a passage in the Meditations of the Royal Philosopher, Marcus Antoninus, *ἔνδον βλέπε, ἔνδον ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*,—look within, for within is the fountain of good. Further yet this intellectual heart is always beating, the pulses of it never rest; thought rises upon thought, and desire succeeds desire. The motion is perpetual, constant, and vehement; so vehement, that the swiftest bodily motion, no, not that of the starry orb, is comparable to

---

* Journals, vol. i. p. 52.

it; so vehement that it cannot be discerned or numbered, and comes nearer to a rest than to a motion, as the swiftest turnings round of a globe look like standing still. Now what a dangerous thing is such a motion as this, if not rightly determined! Of what vast heights in goodness is it capable! And to what vast heights of wickedness may it rise if not well governed."*

That in this inward scrutiny we are liable to deceive ourselves, is only to bring the prophet's† warning to bear on the particular subject of self-examination. The dangers besetting this duty are not simply those of self-deceit in its ordinary sense, i. e. the too favourable interpretation of our own faults, or the unconsciousness of their existence, but of a more subtle kind. A mirror is a necessary instrument, but may become a snare. Self-examination may insensibly become a self-contemplative habit. In such a mind as Mr. Martyn's it could not feed the lighter and vainer passions, which are ever uppermost in listless and shallow men. In him there was no such pabulum to fasten on. The form it would rather take with his keener and speculative mind would be that of attempting to ascertain the gradual accessions of energy to the habits of the soul, by acts of *direct intuition.* Although it is true that no man " knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of a man that is within him," yet the question returns, *how* is he to know them? Are not the healthy energies of the mind to be perceived as the healthy energies of the body, not by direct intuition, for which we have no faculties, but by their sensible effects? Perhaps self-examination can hardly extend beyond the noting of *faults,* without endangering the character by self-elation, or morbid depression, or by referring to the agency of God, what is in fact no more than the movements of the animal spirit. That Mr. Martyn was aware of this we have his own witness in the following very solemn passage in a letter, written the year before his death, " I have been often deceived in times past, and erroneously called animal spirits joy in the Holy Ghost."‡ We think we can trace a marked difference in the tone of his Journals written in England, where the calls upon his attention and labour, although many and various, were thrown off with ease, and that of his diary kept during the voyage, but most of all during his residence in India and Persia, when his mind was intensely concentrated on external objects, such as the unremitting work of translating Holy Scripture. He lost not a shade of his fervent devotional spirit, while his mind was braced up to a healthier tone. The urgent demands of duty, and the calm contemplation of his Master's example, corrected without relaxing anything of his inward self-examination, the tendency of his mind to a somewhat morbid introversion upon itself.

---

* Norris on the Sixth Beatitude. St. Matth. v. 8.

† 1 Jerem. xvii. 9.

‡ Journals, &c. vol. ii. 325.

This unsparing habit of recording against himself the faults of his daily life, was the secret force which threw out his system of self-discipline. From the earliest time of his deeper seriousness, his days were distributed into seasons of prayer, the frequency and duration of which are such as we seldom meet with in modern biographies. We find in his Journals passages such as the following: "I rather think a regular distribution of the day for prayer to obtain the three great graces of humility, love, and resignation would be far the best way to grow in them."* "When I got to my room I continued about two hours in prayer."† Then in a few pages we find him reading and praying with his college servant. To these devotional acts must of course be added the blessed daily service of the college chapel, and frequently of the parish churches in Cambridge, where he was wont to attend, and often to officiate. When with these habitual exercises we mix up the labours of a tutor and of a close and diligent student, we are reminded of the biographies of earlier and better days of our Holy Mother, when her sons were wont for themselves to break their days into canonical hours. "Besides occasional and supernumerary addresses," we read of one who is a worthy type of our catholicism, his certain perpetual returns exceeded David's seven times a day. As soon as he was ready (which was usually early) he prayed in his chamber with his servant, in a peculiar form composed for that purpose. After this he retired to his own more secret devotions in his closet. Betwixt ten and eleven in the morning he had a solemn intercession in reference to the national calamities; to this, after a little distance, succeeded the morning office of the Church, which he particularly desired to perform in his own person, and would by no means accept the ease of having it read by any other. In the afternoon he had another hour of private prayer, which on Sundays he enlarged, and so religiously observed that if any necessary business or charity had diverted him at the usual time, he repaired his soul at the cost of his body, and notwithstanding the injunction of his physicians, which in other cases he was careful to obey, spent the supper time therein. About five of the clock the solemn private prayers for the nation, and the evening service of the Church, returned. At bed-time his private prayers closed the day; and after all, even the night was not without its office, the 51st Psalm being his designed midnight entertainment. In his prayers, as his attention was fixed and steady, so was it inflamed with passionate fervour, insomuch that very frequently his transport threw him prostrate on the earth; his tears also would interrupt his words; the latter happening not only upon the pungent exigencies of present or impending judgments, but in the common service of the Church.* To these seasons of prayer Mr. Martyn added also frequent fasts, both as an ordinary means for the chastening and purifying of his mind, and also from time to time as a special check and counteraction to other and lower influences, which seemed to him to withdraw it from habitual consciousness of things unseen.

---

* Journal, i. 60.

† Ibid. 187.

"I have declined so sensibly," he writes in one place, "these last two or three days, that I design to devote to-morrow to fasting and prayer."† "Oh that I had a more piercing sense of the divine presence. How much sin in the purest services. If I were sitting in heavenly places with Christ, or rather with my thoughts habitually there, how would every duty become easy! . . . 'Memoria tua sancta et dulcedo tua beatissima possideat animam meam, atque in invisibilium amorem rapiat illam.' This day was set apart for a public fast. I prayed rather more than two hours, chiefly with confession of my own sins, those of my family, and the church; alas so much was required to be said on the first head, that I should have been at no loss to have dwelt upon it the whole day."‡

Such were Mr. Martyn's habits of self-discipline at the time when he resolved to dedicate himself to the work of a missionary. We cannot but think that such a resolution involved, in his case, a greater sacrifice of self than it would in the case of most men.

It would appear that his health had been delicate from childhood; and that in his family was the sad heir-loom of a consumptive tendency. Without doubt the unobserved resistance of an unkindly constitution is often the too stubborn hindrance, and always the severe antagonist, of self-discipline, and habitual striving after high measures of perfection. From the time of taking his degree, he had frequent indications of secret disease, which, after he had entered upon his life of hardship, gave no ambiguous warnings. "O my dearest S—," he wrote, in 1809, to his only surviving sister, who, it seems, did not live to receive his letter, "that disease which preyed upon our mother, and dear sister, and has often shown itself in me, has, I fear, attacked you."—*Memoir*, p. 320. This question must therefore have entered into the deliberate consideration of his future course, and must have been deliberately disregarded.

---

* Bishop Fell's Life of Hammond, 28, fol.

† Journals, 1, 187.

‡ Memoir, 51.

There were other influences which might have made any ordinary man relax from his purpose of self-devotion. He had a very pure delight in letters and science, the highest academical distinction had been awarded to him. He could not have been unconscious that the largest rewards (as men speak) of moral and intellectual worth, were open to him at home ; to these must be added the closest friendships, the fondest family affections, and an attachment, the strength of which he continually learned, as separation, and a series of after-difficulties, made its realization impossible. Any one of these have, ere now, made a man shrink from a high resolve, and perhaps few men would successfully encounter their combined solicitations. But Mr. Martyn well knew what the Apostle intended when he said, "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier." Of the last, which was both a sacrifice and a disappointment, he wrote afterwards,—

"O how have I been crossed from childhood, and yet how little benefit have I received from these chastisements of my God. The Lord now sanctify this, that since the last desire of my heart is also withheld, I may with resignation turn away for ever from the world, and henceforth live forgetful of all but God. I shall never have to regret I have loved Thee too well. Thou hast said, 'Delight thyself in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thy heart.'"—*Journals*, ii. 130.

"Endeavouring to keep in mind that I was born to suffer, and striving to be happy under every cross, not by discerning something agreeable in it, but because it is the will of God."—*Ibid.* 158.

He was one that was at no time afraid of evil tidings, for he had been long preparing himself for every such trial.

"I see a great work before me now, (he wrote in 1803,) namely, the subduing and mortifying of my perverted will ; what am I that I should dare to do my own will, even if I were not a sinner? But now how plain, how reasonable to have the love of Christ constraining me to be his faithful, willing servant, cheerfully taking up the cross that he shall appoint me."—*Journals*, i. 47.

"It appeared to me monstrous and horrible, that any creature should seek its will in opposition to God's will."—*Ibid.* 69.

The gradual formation of this perfect self-renunciation is remarkably illustrated in the feelings with which he regarded the life of trial to which he had devoted himself. We find him at first beset by the misgivings naturally mingling with all high purposes of self-devotion. Sometimes mistrust of himself—not at all allayed by the officious kindness of friends, who would charitably tell him that he had "neither strength of mind nor of body for the work," and sometimes by a foresight of the severe trials and hardships he must endure.

"The dejection I sometimes labour under, seems to arise from the prospect of the difficulties I have to encounter in the whole of my future life. The thought that I must be unceasingly employed in the same kind of work amongst poor ignorant people, is what my proud spirit revolts at. To be obliged to submit to a thousand uncomfortable things that must happen to me, whether as a minister or a missionary, is what flesh cannot endure."—*Memoir*, p. 33.

By degrees the single aim of his heart was steadied, and the object of his deliberate choice seemed continually to dilate, and to gather a brightness and an attractiveness which determined his every thought and affection to itself.

"I was under disquiet at the prospect of my future work, encompassed, as it appeared, with difficulties; but I trusted I was under the guidance of Infinite Wisdom, and on that I could rest. Mr. Johnson, who had returned from a mission, observed that the crosses to be endured were far greater than could be conceived; but none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto me, so that I might finish my course with joy! Had some disheartening thoughts at night, at the prospect of being stripped of every earthly comfort; but who is it that maketh my comforts to be a source of enjoyment? Cannot the same hand make cold, and hunger, and nakedness, and peril, to be a train of ministering angels conducting me to glory."—*Journals*, i. 32.

When on board ship at the Cape, he writes,—

"I am so far from regretting that I ever came on this delightful work, were I to choose for myself, I could scarcely find a situation more agreeable to my taste."

Out of the many passages in his Indian Journals, carrying out the same testimony, we select only one, written in 1811.

"When I set myself to invent a case of perfect happiness, a case which shall comprehend every thing that ever appeared desirable to me in the days of my vanity or since, I cannot by any means persuade myself that I should be happy: true there appears a change which seems strange to myself. I find it impossible to create, even in imagination, a terrestrial paradise. After trying this thing and that, I see that there is enjoyment rather in giving than receiving. To deny oneself for the good of others, rather than embrace a great number of good things for oneself. It is a greater happiness to obey God than to please self."—*Journals*, ii. 328.

So well had he apprehended the admonition, "Quantum a te vales exire, tantum in me poteris transire. Sicut nihil foris concupiscere internam pacem facit, sic se interius relinquere Deo conjungit." This perfect exinanition of self is the main feature of Mr. Martyn's latter days. In India we find him applying his whole mind to the translation of Holy Scripture, with an earnestness which showed that he regarded himself but as an instrument for an appointed end, and his life desirable only so long as would suffer him to finish the work that was given him to do. He was engaged at the same moment on two translations of the New Testament into the Hindostanee and Persian languages, in which two-fold undertaking he was aided by an Indian and an Arab. These worthies were a perpetual trial of the passive graces of Mr. Martyn's mind. They were of course unremitting and unrelenting in their mutual recriminations and hostility. The following picture is most graphic:—

"Mirza happened to hear all Sabat's querulous harangue, and in order to vex, and disgust him effectually, rode almost into his house and came in with his shoes. This irritated the Arab, but Mirza's purpose was not answered. Mirza began next day to tell a parcel of lies about Sabat, and to bring proofs of his own learning. The manifest tendency of all this was to make a division between Sabat and me, and to obtain his salary and work for himself. Oh, the hypocrisy and wickedness of an Indian! I never saw a more remarkable contrast in two men than in Mirza and Sabat. One is all exterior, the other has no outside at all. One a most consummate man of the world, the other an artless child of the Desert."*

The Hindostanee version of the New Testament was fully approved; but the Persian being thought to contain too many Arabic words and idioms, Mr. Martyn, although his health was then exhibiting the most unequivocal signs of decay, resolved, with his characteristic devotedness, to go into Persia, there to complete the translation. This he was permitted to do.

The following very striking narrative exhibits his moral courage and solitary devotedness. Writing to the late Bishop of Madras, then the Rev. Daniel Corrie, from Shiraz, 1811, he says

"As there is nothing at all in this dull place to take the attention of the people, no trade, manufactures, or news, every event at all novel is interesting to them. You may conceive therefore what a strong sensation was produced by the stab I aimed at the vitals of Mohammed. Before five people had seen what I wrote, defences of Islam swarmed into ephemeral being from all the Moulwee maggots of the place, but the more judicious men were ashamed to let me see them. One Moollah called Aga Acber, determined to distinguish himself. He wrote with great acrimony on the margin of my pamphlet, but passion had blinded his judgment, so that he smote the wind. One day I was on a visit of ceremony to the prime minister, and sitting in great state by his side, fifty visitors in the same hall, and five hundred clients without, when who should make his appearance, but my tetric adversary, the said Aga Acber, who came for the express purpose of presenting the minister with a piece he had composed in defence of the Prophet; and sitting down told me, he should present me with a copy that day. 'There are four answers,' said he, 'to your objection against his using the sword.' 'Very well,' said I, 'I shall be glad to see them, though I made no such objection.' Eager to display his attainments in all branches of science, he proceeded to call in question the truth of our European philosophy, and commanded me to show that the earth moved and not the sun. I told him, 'that in matters of religion, where the salvation of men was concerned, I would give up nothing to them, but as for points in philosophy they might have it all their own way.' This was not what he wanted, so after looking at the minister, to know if it was not a breach of good manners, to dispute at such a time, and finding that there was nothing contrary to custom, but that on the contrary he rather expected an answer, I began, but soon found that he could comprehend nothing without diagrams. A moonshee in waiting was ordered to produce his implements, so there was I drawing figures, while hundreds of men were looking on in silence. But all my trouble was in vain, the Moollah knew nothing whatever of mathematics."*

---

* Journals, ii. 166. This unhappy man, Sabat, after professing Christianity for many years, apostatized, and wrote an attack on the Gospels. He again professed repentance, and declared that his attack on revelation was made as a revenge upon one to whom he thought an attack on Christianity would be more painful than a personal injury. He never spoke of Mr. Martyn without the most profound respect, and shed tears of grief whenever he recalled how severely he had tried the patience of this faithful servant of God. He mentioned several anecdotes to show with what extraordinary sweetness of temper Martyn had borne his numerous provocations. "He was less a man," he said, "than an angel from heaven." This wretched penitent after much inconstancy of conduct became involved in a war at Penang, was taken by the enemy and thrown in a sack into the sea.—Memoir of the Rev. T. Thomason, by the Rev. John Sargent, 242—249.

After a year's residence in Persia, when the object of his life was done, and his health had sunk under intense attacks of fever, and other kinds of suffering, he "set his horse's head towards Constantinople," with the intention of returning to England.

The last days of this devoted servant of God are too deeply affecting to be passed over. After many days travelling on horses, each day closing in with more or less of suffering, Mr. Martyn came soon after sunset on the 2d of October to a small village. There they halted for the night. He endeavoured to find a room where he might be alone.

"Tempted by money they brought me to a stable-room, and Hassan (the Tartar guide) and a number of others planted themselves there with me. My fever here increased to a violent degree; the heat in my eyes and forehead was so great that the fire almost made me frantic. I entreated that it might be put out, or that I might be carried out of doors. Neither was attended to. My servant, who, from my sitting in that strange way on the ground, believed me delirious, was deaf to all I said. At last I pushed my head in among the luggage, and lodged it on the damp ground, and slept.

---

* Journals, ii. 375, 376.

"Oct. 5. The sleep had refreshed me, but I was feeble and shaken. Yet the merciless Hassan hurried me off. . . . I felt tolerably well till a little after sunset, when the ague came on with a violence I had never before experienced. I felt as if in a palsy, my teeth chattering, and my whole frame violently shaken. . . . . The cold fit, after continuing two or three hours, was followed by a fever, which lasted the whole night and prevented sleep.

"Oct. 6. No horses being to be had, I had an unexpected repose. I sat in the orchard, and thought with sweet comfort and peace of my God: in solitude, my company, my friend and comforter. Oh, when shall time give place to eternity! When shall appear that new heaven, and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness! Where there shall in nowise enter in any thing that defileth: none of that wickedness which has made men worse than wild beasts, none of those corruptions which add still more to the miseries of mortality, shall be seen or heard of any more."

After this came on ten days of unknown sufferings, and on the 16th he entered into the joy of his Lord. In him was indeed realized a large measure of that righteousness which is the incommunicable gift of the perfect. "Cuncta enim licita respuunt, ad despectum mundi sublimiter accinguntur, licere sibi nolunt omne quod libet, bona sibi amputant etiam concessa, contemnunt visibilia, invisibilibus accenduntur, lamentis gaudent, in cunctis semetipsos humiliant, et sicut nonnulli peccata operum, sic ipsi cogitationum deplorant. Quid itaque istos dixerim, nisi et justos, et pœnitentes, qui se et in pœnitentia de peccato cogitationis humiliant, et recti semper in opere perseverant?" *

We must here break off our too cursory remarks on the character of this holy man.

It is no matter of surprise to us that his friend and biographer should have found it necessary to correct, by a personal attestation in the tenth edition of the memoir, an impression left by it, upon the minds of common readers, that Mr. Martyn was of a gloomy temperament. We say we are not surprised, not indeed that we partake of the impression, but because we should have marvelled how the religious world of this day, which, like its brother world, is too brisk and bright to sympathize with the deeper tone and severer cast of primitive faith, should ever read of such a life without some indefinite feeling of recoil. Modern religionists turn away from such a type of severe holiness, as purchasers of modern portraits, from the stern and awful forms of early Christian art. Of all the doctrines of the Cross, that which energetically realizes in us the mystery shadowed upon us in holy baptism, is the least desired. Via lucis, via crucis, is the

---

* S. Greg. M. Hom. in Luc. xv. 1.

unchangeable faith of Catholics, but the illumination of later days reveals the vicarious cross alone. But Mr. Martyn's faith was not so, he lived as one of that goodly fellowship, whose song in the house of their pilgrimage is "Vita tua, via nostra, per sanctam patientiæ viam ambulamus ad te, qui es corona nostra."

One more general remark we must make before we conclude, and that is—how strikingly the vigorous mind of Mr. Martyn felt around for that system, which should have anticipated the necessities of his spiritual warfare, and failing to find it, proceeded, as by an instinct of its own, to throw out a system for its own support. Hence his frequent hours of prayer, his often fastings, and the ascetic discipline which he imposed upon himself. Hence also the ardent thirsting for the communion of saints militant, but most of all the insatiable yearning of his soul for the fellowship of the mystical body gone before him into paradise. "I love to converse, (speaking of their writings,) as it were, with those holy bishops and martyrs, with whom, I hope, through grace, to spend a happy eternity."* "The example of the Christians of the early ages has been a source of sweet reflection to me frequently to-day; the holy love, and devout meditations of Augustine and Ambrose, I delight to think of."† The system of the Church is the mould in which the character of those that are born to its inheritance is formed to the highest cast of Christian perfection, and the standard to which the devout of those that are born without it are continually tending. Archbishop Leighton may be taken as an example of the latter, and Mr. Martyn of the former principle. Our unhappy lot is to find ourselves, though born to the inheritance, in fact defrauded of our portion. The last century and a half has rested like a noisome vapour on the English Church, and now that it seems partially dispersing, it exhibits, as it is drawn up, the fair structures of the Catholic inheritance falling piecemeal, and the vigour of its children palsied. The hereditary treasure of doctrine and discipline has been laid up where the thief entereth and the rust corrupteth. We no longer enter into houses that we have not builded, nor draw out of wells that we have not digged, but each man is doomed to squander the earlier and better part of life, a stranger to his high descent, and then to set about rearing the fabric, and accumulating the treasure he ought to have inherited. But it is not every man that has the subdued but masterly intellect of Mr. Martyn,—it is not every man that is above prejudice, and fearless in the avowal of truth as he was.* Moreover, the religious teachers of these days are possessed with a principle of thorough eclecticism. They are harmonists of doctrines and ordinances, every man a centre, forming his own system, one adopting as his principle a so-called affinity of doctrines, and another the sensible cravings of man's nature; both proceeding by one and the same rule, and differing only in the accidental mode of its application. It is true that all mysteries converge to their point of emanation in the divine mind; and the system of the Church Catholic is in absolute harmony with the wants of God's redeemed creatures. But neither is the convergency of doctrines, nor the harmony of ordinances, the test of truth *to us,* for the latter may not be felt, nor the former perceptible. *To us* the proof of Catholic truth is an external witness, in kind the same (although in degree continually diminishing) with that which attests the fact and inspiration of Holy Scripture.

---

* Memoirs, 126. † Ibid. 128.

Before we close this review, we feel it right to plead guilty to a charge of partiality. Δεῖ γὰρ προεπιπλήττειν. We confess that we have consciously shrunk from noting many forms of opinion and modes of expression; we shall not, therefore, be understood to sanction them. We think that no man can read these Journals without feeling that there is a living bond of fellowship, unaided by sight or sense, bringing all members of the body to a most real, but most mysterious intimacy. "And shall not that recognition be universal? Think ye that ye shall know me then, because ye have known me now; but that my father, or one, it may be, that was long ago a Bishop of this Church, ye shall not know hereafter, because ye have not known him here? Ye shall know them all. They that shall meet *in the resurrection* shall not know each other by looking on the face. There shall be a mutual knowledge with a higher intuition. All shall see, and more perfectly than even Prophets here are wont. They shall see by a vision which is of God, for that all shall be full of God."†

We look then upon these Journals with an awful veneration, as upon the slough of a pure spirit, which has striven, and overcome, and cast its earthly weeds. And will add one only word more, and that of warning to such as may read the record of this saint's warfare with an indolent and listless spirit. We believe that no man can read it with safety, except he that will in some measure put his shoulder to the yoke of a like mortifying discipline. The Church, at this moment, is making loud and urgent demands for men of fervent devotion, unshrinking renunciation of self, and deadness to the world. To such as have heart to follow in that way, Mr. Martyn is in very truth a burning and a shining light.

---

* "Read through in my palanquin," writes Mr. M., "the Missionary Magazine for 1805, and almost felt glad that I was out of the way of such vapid religionism as is too prevalent in England. Though they are the people of God that write, as I do not doubt, yet, alas, how unedifying are most of the pages of a modern magazine, though religious! May I myself be kept from that regard to public opinion, which in such a melancholy degree seems to actuate so many of the ministers, missionary societies, and missionaries of the present day."—*Journals,* ii. 109.

† S. Aug. Serm. in Diebus Pasch. xiv. 5.

Art. V.—*Memorials of Oxford.* By James Ingram, D. D., President of Trinity College. 3 Vols. Oxford. Parker.

Most persons who fall in with this work would but consider it as a collection of beautiful prints, in illustration of one of the most beautiful cities in Europe. In consequence, they will be disposed to place it on their drawing table; a position, which serves to confirm the impression which the first view of it creates. And it really is a most interesting publication, considered merely as a work of art; but those who have been led to cast their eyes on the letter-press, will find a kind of matter there of a very different complexion from the running accompaniment, in large type and small sense, which, in such publications is commonly used to swell the volume without hurting its character.

Dr. Ingram, however, the learned writer of the letter-press, is evidently not a man to figure as a mere chevalier aux dames, or to serve as an elegant appendage to the fashion of the hour. Judging by the work before us, we should say he was as little like a writer in an annual or album as any author we ever read. He is, apparently, one of a race of men, now almost extinct, who used to live all their days both in and for the University. A place like Oxford, it need scarcely be said, alters very much in the outward characteristics of its society, in the course of a very few years; and more so, in a time like this, when alterations and developments of a serious nature are taking place in the structure of society in general. The light which shines so brightly in the metropolis and other great towns, has shot not a few of its piercing rays into the groves and halls of academical repose; newspapers, magazines, and reviews, cannot possibly be made contraband; the fact cannot be kept concealed from their inmates that they are the object of dislike to a considerable portion of the community, and of assault in certain very influential assemblies; and, in consequence, there has been, more or less, a revival of that ancient energetic spirit, that resolve to take part and to have a voice in the world's matters, which is a distinguishing mark of the University in history. Its members have long determined that Church and State shall neither do nor suffer, without their having a share in the doing or suffering. The circumstances of the times seem to force such a course upon a place, which has never been a mere abode of the muses, but has ever twined the myrtle round the sword; yet at the same time, granting this, so much is clear, that the muses suffer by it, and do not thank the times for its necessity.

They have to mourn over the gradual disappearance of classical taste, antiquarian research, and local knowledge. Oxford was a place of leisurely thought, of multifarious but undigested erudition, of wayward irregular exertion, of enthusiastic college feeling, of repose relieved by the graceful or splendid sallies of wit. It was a place equally favourable for genius and for abuses. No examinations or class-lists directed the mind either of tutor or pupil to definite objects and necessary preparations, or raised their eyes from the walls of their College to the University schools, and from the schools to the busy walks of life. Oxford was their home, their resting-place, and had both the advantages and disadvantages of a home; it was a very dear place, but a very idle one. It was not a place of passage, or of lodging for a year or two, or a means to an end, so frequently as it now is. Such a state of things, had its capabilities been fully understood, might have been productive of most beneficial results; the fault was, not that inducements for exertion were not supplied from without, but that there were no active principles stirring within. One good effect, however, actually followed; very few Fellows of Colleges, we suspect, could now be found, who are well acquainted with the history or antiquities of their own society; how it grew up into its present state, and by whose munificence it has been gradually enriched. On the other hand, talk with an old incumbent visiting the place for a few days, and, if a resident yourself, you will be surprised, if you have not cause to be ashamed, at his accurate knowledge of the localities and peculiarities of a place where your outward man has lived perchance for years, but your mind has been away. While you have been, rightly or wrongly, absorbed in ecclesiastical proceedings or scientific associations, he knows all about the College, from the curious show-books of the library, and the number in full of old silver tankards in the hall, down to the excellence of the pump-water, or the make of the common-room chairs. Such is the difference between the past age and the present;—between this busy anxious day, and a time when Oxford was loved on its own account, and was enjoyed with scarce a thought of what was beyond it.

The learned president of Trinity College, who seems to have had a most efficient co-adjutor in Mr. Parker, the publisher, has shown in the work before us, to what good account a well-stored mind may turn devotion towards a place which is beautiful as youth and venerable as age; and since his antiquarian lore is very uncommon at present, and may have escaped attention under the fascination of Messrs. Mackenzie and Le Keux's share in the work, we think it may be interesting here to put together some leading facts relative to the early history of the University, which he has scattered through it, before or apart from the existence of colleges. We call them facts, in an antiquarian sense, not as ignorant that much may be said for and against every assignable point of past history, but in order to intimate that it is our intention, not to dispute or investigate, but to surrender ourselves to the pleasing imagination that there is such a thing as certainty attainable by the human mind, as regards matters which the eye has not seen.

Little can be narrated in any connected way concerning the University previous to the Norman conquest. The ravages of the Danes, civil troubles, and the debased state of religion, interrupted and dissipated, at least the records, if not the schools and studies themselves of the peaceful place; and the scanty glimpses which are left to us are like the broken remembrances with which we retrace that first mysterious portion of our childhood, ere memory has yet become continuous, or we come to live in the thought of our own identity. However, amid the dim notices of almost fabulous ages, on which the institutions existing in later times force us back, we are led to dwell upon one passage of Saxon history, both from its interest and the satisfactory evidence on which its main outline rests,—the history of St. Frideswide. It seems, that about the year 727 a certain governor, provost, or viceroy, " subregulus," as he is called, of the name of Didan, ruled over a large portion of the city of Oxford, with dignity and honour. His wife's name was Saffrida; and their daughter was called Frideswide. Having received a religious education from a female of eminent sanctity, this young lady not only embraced the monastic life herself, but induced twelve other of her equals, of respectable families, to do the like. Her mother dying about this time, Didan seeking consolation, according to the fashion of those times, in some work of piety, employed himself in the construction of a conventual Church within the precincts of the city; and having dedicated it in honour of St. Mary and All Saints, he committed it to the superintendence of his daughter. This Church, which was known by the name of " St. Mary of Oxford prope Tamesin," or " on the Thames," was the rudiment of the present Cathedral, as the priory attached to it was of Christ Church.

Frideswide's Priory was, even from the first, something beyond a simple religious foundation. She died October 19th, 740, and was buried in her own church: but even before her death, or shortly after, the king of Mercia, in whose territory Oxford lay, (Ethelbald,) constructed certain inns for the advancement of learning, in connexion with the sacred edifice. Alfred, 150 years later, after wresting the city from the Danes, restored them. Nothing is known of her foundation for another hundred years, that is, till A. D. 1000, by which date the priory of St. Frideswide had been richly endowed, its territories increased, and its church enlarged. Oxford was, at that time, the metropolis of Mercia, and had been a favourite seat both of Saxon and Danish monarchs. King Ethelred (1004) built the tower, which, with an additional Norman story and spire, is still standing. So great was the king's satisfaction at his own improvements, that he calls it, in the half-modernized orthography of an extant MS., "myn owne Mynster in Oxenford." Another hundred years brought a fresh series of changes; the nuns were gone, never to return; secular canons had succeeded, had fallen into disorder, and in turn been dispossessed; and in their place an austere Norman, chaplain to Henry I., was made the prior of an establishment of regulars. Under this form the foundation remained till the time of Wolsey, when those further changes were made which brought it into its present shape. Meanwhile, the prior and canons of St. Frideswide were some of the most learned and scientific persons of their times, and their patroness was proportionably honoured. Her relics, it seems to be clearly ascertained, were, in 1180, translated, in Wood's words, "from an obscure to a more noted place in the Church," being deposited in a reliquary, which Dr. Ingram supposes to remain to this day; miracles are said to have followed; rich offerings were made at her shrine, and ample endowments added to her foundation. A more splendid shrine was dedicated for the purpose of receiving her remains in 1289, and one still more splendid, about 1480. Sermons were preached at her cross, the university authorities went in annual procession to her altar, and as late as 1434, she is called in a public instrument, "the special advocate of the flourishing University of Oxford."

Such is the history of the earliest endowment for learning, in a place which was destined to be so fruitful in noble institutions. The next that is to be noticed, brings us back to the important era which, while it forms a sort of commencement of our civil history, brought the University also into a new stage of its existence. Only ten years had passed after the troubles attending the Conquest, in which Oxford largely partook, when we find signs of returning life in a spot which has since that time so often needed, and so often shown a similar pertinacity of life. The Castle Tower, which still is seen on the left, by travellers leaving for Bath or Cheltenham, belonged to the Collegiate Church of St. George, and was founded at that date by Robert D'Oiley for secular canons of the order of St. Augustine, being such (observes Wood) as were " most fit for a University, and not bound to keep their cloister, as regulars are." Here they continued till their translation to Oseney Abbey, in 1149, " at which time," says the same writer, " this their said habitation became a nursery for secular students, subject to the Chancellor's jurisdiction." Brumman le Riche endowed this same Church of St. George, at its first foundation, with land in the northern suburbs of Oxford; whence, as Dr. Ingram supposes, rose the tradition that the University was anciently on that side the town. Thus established as a learned institution, it continued, in the patronage of Oseney Abbey, till the dissolution of the latter; being governed by statutes similar in some respects to those of more recent colleges, and consisting of a warden, fellows, and scholars. The warden was always to be chosen from the canons of Oseney; the fellows and scholars were sworn to the performance of Divine service, and to obedience to the warden, and to a life of charity and purity. There were five secular priests, and the scholars were in number twelve, for the most part Welsh. Such was another of the earliest literary foundations of the place; being situated on a spot originally a palace, and now a gaol.

Since Oseney Abbey has been mentioned, it may be allowed us in a few words to take notice of this celebrated establishment, though it lies somewhat beyond the line of our subject. It was founded, as has been said, in the early part of the 12th century, as a priory of Augustinian monks; and so many benefactions poured in, that it soon became an abbey, and ultimately one of the largest and most magnificent in the kingdom. From the great extent and splendour of its buildings, Wood says, " it was one of the first ornaments and wonders of this place and nation." It was situated in an island formed by different branches of the Ouse, Isis, or Thames, whence it derived its name of Oseney. The church dedicated, as St. Frideswide's, to St. Mary the Virgin, was lofty, and was adorned with two towers; its bells were celebrated as the best in England in those times, and are the same as were known in Dean Aldrich's, and down to our own time, as " the merry Christ Church bells." The famous Tom of Oxford, which rings nightly at nine o'clock, was the bell in the clock-tower. The edifice was enriched with a variety of chapels, having not less than twenty-four distinct altars. The abbot's house was also celebrated for its splendour, and was frequently honoured by the company of kings, prelates, and nobles of the first rank; having an hall, as a writer describes it, "more befitting a common society than a private man." The cloisters, the kitchen, the great hall, and the infirmary, were at a corresponding scale of magnificence. King Henry III. after he had raised the siege before Kenilworth, passed his Christmas here; celebrating the season for seven days' space, "with great revelling and mirth." Of all these gorgeous buildings scarcely a vestige now remains, and had not a knowledge of the site been preserved, by tradition and the diligence of antiquarians, it could not have been conjectured. Some unevenness in a broad and fertile meadow marks the site of the great quadrangle; and a wall, gate, and window belonging to its outbuildings are still standing, near a mill which inherits its name.

The seminaries for learning which we have already spoken of, were situated on the banks of the Thames: but now receding from it, we must proceed up the rising ground to the north of the city, to the place now occupied by Worcester College, where lay the land with which Le Riche endowed the church of St. George. Here was the great Benedictine college, founded by John Giffard, baron of Brimesfield, in 1283, for the reception of the novices sent from Benedictine Abbey at Gloucester. In the original documents relating to this place, the site is much extolled on account of its suitableness for study; a consideration which seems to have induced Giffard to enlarge this establishment, as a "generale studium" for all the Benedictine novices in the province of Canterbury; three-fourths of the novices of that community being, it is said, at this era sent to Oxford, and the remainder to Cambridge. The Benedictine monks were then, what they have shown themselves in these later times, a learned body, as their founder designed; and a tax being imposed at a general chapter of the order on the greater abbeys of their fraternity, buildings for the respective students of each community quickly rose. These were distinct from each other, and distinguished by appropriate escutcheons and rebusses over the doors, some of which remain to this day. The students were governed by a superior called "Prior Studentium," chosen by themselves, similarly to the rule, still nominally observed, as regards the election of principals of halls. About the year 1343 we find two chairs of theology established for their instruction, one here, and one at Durham College.

This Durham College was a sister establishment to the last mentioned, being designed as a nursery for the Benedictine priory of Durham, as the former establishment had originated in the wants of the Benedictines of Gloucester. It was founded about 1286, under a grant of land "to God and our Lady, and to St. Cuthbert, and to the prior and convent of Durham," not far from the Benedictines of Gloucester College, and occupying nearly the same site where Trinity College now stands. Several bishops of the see of Durham became their benefactors, among whom Richard Angervyle, or de Bury, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, left them his great collection of books, which was to be open for the use of all students. The library built for this collection by his immediate successor still remains, as does the liberality with which it is opened to novices, though no longer of the Benedictine order. At the end of the same century the foundation consisted of eight fellows, who were to be priests or monks, one being warden or prior, and eight secular scholars; at the time of the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century, with other religious houses, it was suppressed, and its revenues transferred to the new dean and chapter of Durham.

The institutions and schools connected with them, which we have hitherto described, were of a monastic character, richly endowed, and situated in the suburbs of the town, as became places of retirement and of dignity. But meanwhile within the city, and without the advantages resulting from the power and wealth of Augustinians or Benedictines, was growing up a distinct family, as it may be called, of schools, called secular, as the former were called claustral, which became the materials for the most part out of which the collegiate system was afterwards formed. There is a spot in the centre of the city, where Alfred is said to have lived, and which may be called the native place or river-head of three separate societies, still existing—University, Oriel, and Brasenose. Brasenose claims his palace, Oriel his church, and University his school or academy.

Of these Brasenose College is still called in its formal style "the King's Hall," which is the name by which Alfred himself in his laws calls his palace; and it has its present singular name from a corruption of *brasinium*, or *brasin-huse*, as having been originally located in that part of the royal mansion, which was devoted to the then important accommodation of a brew-house.

The history of the adjacent church, which has belonged to Oriel College for above 500 years, introduces to our notice a sort of repetition of the history of St. Frideswide. A nunnery, as we have seen, formed the first rudiments of the University, and of a church of St. Mary's on the banks of the Thames; and a nunnery some little way off it was closely associated with the later secular schools, out of which the present colleges have arisen, and with the second St. Mary's Church in the heart of the city. The liberty of Littlemore lies on an elevated plain, between two and three miles to the south of Oxford towards London. It was in former times covered with woods, and is bounded by a brook which joins the Thames. Situated upon this brook, even in the Saxon days, was a convent, which was rebuilt soon after the Conquest, and the ruins of which still remain bearing its original Saxon name of Mynchery. It belonged to nuns of the Benedictine order, whose devotion to the advancement of learning showed itself worthy of the ancient rule which they professed. What was its first connection with Oxford does not clearly appear from the work before us, but so much we know, that the church which Alfred is said to have built on the site of the present University Church, is incidently spoken of as St. Mary's, even as early as the Doomsday survey, and is also known to be dedicated to "our Lady of Littlemore." This church Alfred seems, according to the general current of history and tradition, to have made the nucleus of his assembled scholæ or places of education, of which a religious idea and sanction must ever be the binding principle. From the west end of the church, passing along his palace, "the King's Hall of Brasin-huse," as already described, ran in later times a long street, called School Street, up to the north wall of the city, and this was thickly tenanted and peopled by schools, both claustral and especially secular. These schools were originally attached to the halls there situated, being commonly the largest rooms in it, though others were dependencies of the monastic bodies in the neighbourhood, and were but rooms over the tradesmen's shops. Among the latter the convent of Littlemore is especially to be noticed. Besides being possessed of the ancient hall, now called St. Alban's, and then Nun Hall, to the south of the church, it possessed schools in the street just mentioned, which were called after the name of St. Mary of Littlemore. Nor was this all;—the church of St. Mary itself, as well as its vicinage, was in process of time sought as a kind of refuge and domicile of the learning of the day. In School Street there were, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, as many as thirty-two schools; but before that time the inconvenience of the rooms in the halls used for their meetings had been felt; and in Lent the number of bachelors was sometimes greater than they could contain. In such cases they performed their exercises in or over the larger shops of the citizens; but at length they were led to address themselves to Mary's Church itself. By permission of the crown, to whom the church at that time belonged, a variety of subordinate chapels or chantries were erected about it, and endowed by individuals or fraternities with annual stipends to the officiating priests. Many of these have been entirely obliterated by subsequent alterations and repairs of the edifice, or have assumed different names; though some remained under their former distinctive titles, even after the present church was built, as the University books show. When what is called "a public act" was held, no less than six separate portions of the church and its appendages were assigned to the different faculties and degrees. Of these chapels there still remains the chancel of the old church, said to have been built by Henry I., and our Lady's Chapel, which now bears the name of Adam de Brom, from the altar-tomb there standing of the original founder of St. Mary's College, or as it is now called Oriel, who, being rector of the church, gained it for his new foundation, and was there buried.

While the schools of the early university thus gathered under the shade, nay (if we may be allowed the figure) even in the branches of St. Mary's,—or rather literally, like "the swallow" in the Psalms, lodged in still more sacred parts of it,—the same venerable building also became the seat of a public library. This was begun in the first years of the fourteenth century, over the chapel of Henry I. about the time when the Church passed into the possession of the new foundation of Oriel; but in consequence of disputes which followed between that society and the University, it was not brought into use for nearly a hundred years. The chamber still remains and is the present Law School, which, still forming part of a sacred building, is a curious remains of a state of things long past away. As to the present church, with which we are here comparatively little concerned, it may suffice to say that it lies for the most part on the south of the ancient building, that the tower was built, or at least completed, under the superintendence of Adam de Brom in the beginning of the fourteenth century, the chancel by a Provost of Oriel in the middle of the fifteenth, and the nave and aisle by the University in the end of the same century.

While these additions and improvements were making in the church the schools were gradually withdrawn from its sacred precincts, and re-assembled upon their present site. Of the existing buildings the beautiful Divinity School was not finished till towards the end of the fifteenth century; and the quadrangle in James I.'s reign. A remarkable instance of the vicissitudes of the place occurred in the interval. The usual exercises and scholastic acts in the University being suspended during the religious troubles in Edward VI.'s time, the whole area between the divinity school and the buildings which stood on the site of the present quadrangle was converted into a garden and a pig-market; and the schools themselves being abandoned by the masters and scholars, were used by glovers and laundresses. In Wood's quaint language, "there where Minerva sat as regent for several ages, was nothing remaining all the reign of King Edward VI. but wretched solitariness, and nothing but a dead silence appeared."

We have now seen Alfred's palace develope itself, if we may so speak, into St. Mary's Church and the Schools, as representatives of the two great elements of education, religion and learning; but to complete the account, notice should be taken of the much debated point whether that celebrated king gave to any of his schools a principle of continuity, or in more intelligible language, whether he founded or established any particular body. This, as is well known, is maintained in the affirmative by University College, which asserts that it is the identical school, hall, or inn which Alfred instituted; and Dr. Ingram considers that this claim does not rest on such vague authority as is commonly supposed. It is recognized in an order of parliament as early as 1384, and in licenses of mortmain and other grants from the crown in the respective reigns of Henry IV. and VI., Elizabeth, and James I.; moreover it was indirectly but distinctly confirmed in a judgment of the court of King's Bench in 1726. As far however as the question is an historical one, we only know the following fact;—that the bequest of the founder of the College in the thirteenth century was employed in buying the Brasenose or Brasinhuse, with its schools, which has already been described as Alfred's palace; near which the members of the College resided for about eighty years, when they seem to have removed to their present site.

To the general inquirer it is more interesting to recognize in these early events connected with University College the first dawn of that collegiate system, which is the form into which at present the University is almost or altogether cast. Colleges seem to have arisen in consequence of the inconveniences necessarily attendant upon the irregular state of University education when carried beyond its original religious limits. When literature, no longer confined within the precincts and discipline of a monastery, wandered forth in the halls and chambers of School Street, and dispersed itself among a hundred independent parties, what was to be expected as its fortune but confusion and vicissitude? At the first part of the thirteenth century the disorders consequent upon such free trade in letters reached their height;—and what aggravated their seriousness was the almost incredible number of students whom the reputation of the place attracted thither. In the last years of Henry III. they are said to have amounted to thirty thousand; while in the beginning of the same monarch's reign there had been no more than three thousand. Just before he came to the throne all three thousand on one occasion seceded from the University, as Matthew Paris tells us, leaving not one behind. Serious tumults and quarrels between hostile parties were also frequent, of which loss of life was no uncommon attendant. Moreover the buildings themselves in which the students were lodged were of a wretched and unsafe description. Fires were frequent; in consequence of which the inhabitants began to build with stone and slate, instead of timber and thatch; and, when they could not afford the expense, they commonly erected a high stone wall between rows of four, or six, or more houses, remains of which are still to be seen. But the institutions which came in with the middle of the thirteenth century brought a remedy for both the physical and moral inconveniences which have been mentioned; to Walter de Merton, the founder of Merton College, (A. D. 1264,) is commonly attributed the introduction of the Collegiate system itself; and William of Wykeham, the founder of New, a century later, was the first to establish it in buildings of suitable splendour and permanence, most of which are actually remaining still.

The history of the Colleges, however, has been too often discussed, and is too generally known, to call for any lengthened consideration here. We have preferred to confine ourselves to the first shape in which an academical system showed itself, when as yet it was cherished in the bosom of sacred institutions, which, as not existing in this day, are almost forgotten. The monastic bodies of the middle ages have not even left their names to the flourishing establishments which are erected on their site, and, more or less, endowed with their property. Yet that they should have risen again, in any shape, in these latter days, is remarkable enough, and most encouraging to those whom the turbulence and dangers of the present hour might else induce to despond. St. Frideswide's Priory, St. George's Chapel, the Abbey of Oseney, the Benedictine establishments for Gloucester and Durham have disappeared; but Christ Church is a magnificent monument to the memory of the abbots and canons regular who preceded it: Trinity occupies the site of Durham, and Worcester the buildings of Gloucester College; St. John's is a revival of a Cistercian establishment founded on the same spot in the fifteenth century; and Wadham has risen amid the ruins of an Augustinian foundation of the thirteenth, whose disputative powers were held in honour in the exercises of the University Schools down to 1800.*

---

* The practice of holding disputations "apud Augustinenses," colloquially called "doing Austins," continued without interruption down to the introduction of the new

Such is the vitality, such the reproductive power, which this celebrated University has been vouchsafed. If persons like ourselves might presume to offer its members any counsel, it would be never to forget that their present life is but a continuation of the life of past ages, that they are, after all, only in a new form and with new names, the Benedictines and Augustinians of a former day. The monastic element, a most important ingredient in the social character of the Church, lingers among them, when the nation at large has absorbed it in the frivolous or evil tempers and opinions of an advanced period of civilization. To the Universities is committed the duty of cherishing and exemplifying Christian simplicity, nobleness, self-devotion, munificence, strictness, and zeal, which have well nigh vanished elsewhere. To them only it falls, especially if chapters are to be swept away, to show that the Christian can be deeply read in the philosophy of ancient truth, and serenely prescient of the future from his comprehension of the past. To them only it falls, as being out of the world, to measure and expose it, and, as being in the heart of the Church, to strengthen her to resist it. It is their *place* to be old-fashioned; let them but have the moral and intellectual strength not to forget or be ashamed of it, but to carry out the doctrines, which are their portion, boldly, without haggling at the cost they must incur to be consistent with themselves. We say this the rather, because we have observed, with some concern, a disposition in certain quarters to shrink from that position which alone has saved them heretofore, or can save them in time to come. Institutions come to nothing when they abandon the principle which they embody; Oxford has ever failed in self-respect, and has injured its inward health and stability, as often as it has forgotten that it was a creation of the middle ages, and has affected new fashions, or yielded to external pressure. It conceded nothing in the Rebellion, but waited to be robbed, and it gained all back in the course of a few years; it submitted, by its own act, to William of Orange, and years of disgrace followed. A few years since a passing humour seized it to open its gates to the Association for Science; Dissenters of all hues were allowed to gaze upon its buildings; " its precious things, the silver and the gold, and the spices and the precious ointment," " there was nothing among its treasures that it showed them not." Four of the most eminent among them, each of a separate

---

examination statute. They were held in the School of Natural Philosophy every Saturday in full term; and every B. A. after his Lent determination, was bound to dispute there once every year, either as opponent or respondent, before he could proceed to his Master's degree.

persuasion, were honoured with degrees; and it was condescendingly predicted by not the least eminent of his body (an Unitarian, we believe), that by such a policy Oxford had added a hundred years to its existence. Scarcely had a twelvemonth passed, when the proper fruits of it appeared; those who had been admitted to covet, felt a greater pang at its gates being closed against them, than pleasure in the memory of the short week when they had been opened; and the visit of the savans to Oxford was the precursor of the bill introduced into the Commons for the permanent admission of Dissenters to its lecture-rooms. Such is the inevitable consequence of aping or trembling at the external world.

And while Oxford ever shows so well as when resisting innovation, and rallying round some ancient principle which is emperilled, it never shows so weakly as when, professing such a course, it yet censures or separates from those who centuries ago did the same. Yet this is an inconsistency to which its members, in common with our whole Church, have been much tempted ever since the Reformation, when political changes and the general growth of liberal notions, have rendered the principles cherished in the University unpopular in the nation. Men cannot bear to be associated in the minds of others with those whom others contemn; and, instead of denying they are really contemptible, they deny that they themselves resemble them. Hence the common practice, of which the University, indeed, affords far fewer specimens than other places, though it is, unhappily, not altogether without them now and then, of men's purchasing for themselves a license for what the world calls intolerance and bigotry, by declaiming against the like alleged failings in their forefathers, or of hiding, as far as may be, their own modicum of so-called formality and superstition, by denouncing those who had a little more of both than themselves. Hence, too, they try to escape the odium of resisting present reforms, by inveighing against the corruptions of the ante-reformation era,—and the imputation of Popery, which with the multitude is a frightful word for every thing that is bad and hateful, by ungenerously charging it on past ages which cannot defend themselves. How much better and honester is it, when asked whether those who resist present innovations would not have also resisted certain parts of the great Reformation, to answer that it is one's duty to stand by whatever is established, till it is proved to be positively wrong, and therefore to maintain many a custom and rule now, which before it was established it would have been equally a duty to resist. Who considers it an inconsistency in Sir R. Peel now to stand by the Reform Act, of which before it had passed he was a strenuous opponent? Who would consider it wise in him, if he continued to oppose what is done and over? Yet who would not consider it an absurdity if he thought the only way to maintain it was to enlarge on its intrinsic merits? This way of viewing the position of the University is intelligible; but it really is losing time and toil to deny, what is as plain as day, that Oxford has, and ever has had, what men of the world will call a popish character, that in opinion and tone of thought, its members are successors of the monks, or that as they oppose the Rowland Hills and Pye Smiths of this day, they would have also opposed the Foxes and Knoxes of the Reformation. Surely it is their wisdom, as they follow, so to avow they follow ancient times; as it is their happiness to know they follow them. Let them not fear to connect themselves with their predecessors; let them discern in their beautiful homes, the awful haunts of past ages, and past ages will stand by them. Let them track out the vestiges of the old city, and with the hero in the poet's romance, they will find a talisman amid the ruins; "the talisman is faith!" or in the words of another poet, who speaks with the affection of a son of Oxford,—

"But thou, my mother! green as erst and pure
Thy willows wave, thy meeting waters glide;
Untarnished on thy matron breast endure
The treasured gems, thy youth's delight and pride,
Firm loyalty, serene and fond,
Wearing untired her lofty bond;
Awful reverence bending low,
Where'er the heavens their radiance throw;
And wisdom's mate, simplicity,
That in the gloom dares trust the guiding arm on high;
These, of old, thy guardians tried,
Daily kneeling at thy side,
And wont by night to fan thy vigil fires,
We feel them hovering now around the aerial spires."

ART. VI.—*The Life of John Jay, First Chief Justice of the United States, and Governor of New York.* By his son, William Jay. 2 vols. 8vo. New York. 1833.

THE authors of great events have seldom taken the pains to record them. The Duke of Wellington would never read Col. Napier's history of the war in Spain, lest he should be "led into a literary controversy more troublesome"* than a winter campaign in La Mancha. What a rarity would be Queen Elizabeth's diary at Tilbury Fort, or the rough notes of Themistocles before the battle of Salamis! His unequalled versatility of talent, and the consciousness that he was acting in the world's foremost theatre, have made Cæsar an exception; yet his incomparable work was designed probably but as a preparatory sketch for some maturer composition. "Ceteri," wrote Hirtius, when this purpose had been frustrated by the dagger of Brutus, "quam bene atque emendate, nos etiam quam facile atque celeriter eos perfecerit, scimus."

---

* Perceval's Remarks on Colonel Napier, p. 59.

In this, as in every other respect, we seem destined to reverse the maxims of our fathers. Talleyrand, imitating the less distinguished miscreants, Vidocq and Barrington, has left a written detail of his intrigues. Chateaubriand has recorded the impression which the same half century has made on a man of honour and a Christian. The increase of correspondence has enabled us to study the character of some of our own distinguished men in their undress, at home, and among their associates. The contrast between persons seen in this manner, "au naturel," and the constrained attitudes put on for exhibition, is self-evident. Yet as the world moves on, society seems to defile and soil the verdure to which it is admitted: men write letters to their wives and children as if the public looked over their shoulders; and diaries become pamphlets, dedicated to their executors. For ourselves, we protest against reading any private journal, which we do not know to have been destined to the fire; for it is not a great book with a lock and key to it, which can ensure the inimitable simplicity of Sir Walter Scott's diary . . . the soliloquy of the great novelist is perfect, till on a sudden he turns round to predict our remarks, when we read the confessions of the well-seeming baronet of Abbotsford.

This fashion of writing private papers for the public, the authors of the American Revolution have carried to a fearful extent. Marshall's Life of Washington, "insanæ molis," is entitled to a painful pre-eminence. Dr. Franklin's philosophical fame is attested by three quarto volumes of correspondence. Thomas Jefferson invented a copying machine, that not a word of his chitchat to his friends might be lost to posterity. The public may be as thankful for the weakness of wrist which sometimes clogged his pen, as a schoolboy when he hears that above 100 books of Livy are wanting. These collections are not without interest. Taken as the testimony of friends to the importance of their writers, they are natural; and the insight which they afford into the springs of action, are at times valuable. But that such documents should be preserved by their writers—that Jefferson, the stern republican, without heart or affection, should write frivolities to women with a polygraph pen, or send them letters marked by the copying press,—is, except in the case of Doddridge, without example on this side of the Atlantic.

The phenomenon may probably be referred to the change which took place in men's habits when attornies were called to legislate, and book-keepers made treaties. The remark applies in a measure to the valuable work before us; but its subject was too sensible a man to enter in his "letter book" what he was not willing should be heard in Broadway, and that he might not come naked before the world, he seems to have sat in full dress at home. His letters are certainly very wanting in vivacity; but we have not the less respect for the man because we find he disliked to gossip about secrets of state, and that his own services were the last topic on which he loved to dwell. Those services, however, appear to have been valued by the better part of his countrymen; and if Washington be the great captain of the United States—Franklin, their philosopher—and Jefferson, their successful politician—the praise of being an most honest and disinterested labourer for the public good belongs to no man more pre-eminently than to the first chief justice of the Union, John Jay.

His family, though not sordid, was without distinction. It was of French extraction: his grandfather had fled after the revocation of the edict of Nantz; and so little did the emigrants forget the tie of kindred, that his boyhood was spent in a village and at a school where French was still vernacular. Thus did the future diplomatist acquire an accomplishment which could scarcely have been expected from the son of a retired New York merchant. At fourteen he was sent to Columbia (then King's) college, at New York; and before he left it, must have convinced the "High Tory" divine who presided there what combustible ingredients lay buried in the then tranquil soil of the colonies.

"A number of students being assembled in the college hall, some of them, either through a silly spirit of mischief, or in revenge for some fault imputed to the steward, began to break the table. The president, attracted by the noise, entered the room, but not so speedily as to find the offenders in the act. He immediately arranged the students in a line, and beginning at one end, asked, 'Did you break the table?' The answer was, 'No.' 'Do you know who did?' Passing along the line, the same questions and answers were asked and received, till he came to Mr. Jay, who was the last but one in the line. To the first question he replied as the others had done, and to the second he answered, 'Yes, sir.' 'Who was it?' 'I do not choose to tell you, sir,' was the unexpected reply. The young gentleman below him returned the same answers. The president expostulated and threatened, but in vain. The contumacious students were called before a board of the professors, where

Mr. Jay made their defence . . . . . . The defence was overruled, and the delinquents were sentenced to be suspended and rusticated. Mr. Jay returned to college at the expiration of his sentence; and Dr. Cooper, by the kindness of his reception, suffered him to perceive that he had not, by his conduct, forfeited any part of his good opinion."—vol. i. p. 15.

Our young Brutus had soon an opportunity of signalizing himself in a wider sphere. In the year 1774, six years after he had been called to the bar, was passed the Boston Port Bill. This was the consummation of those measures by which the British Parliament proposed to tax its colonies. The attempt had been openly made nine years earlier by the Stamp Act, and its abandonment encouraged the Americans to oppose the commercial regulations by which the same end was attained more covertly. The other colonies had thought it sufficient to abstain from taxed commodities; but the boldness of the people of Boston, in destroying a vessel of tea, the property of the East India Company, provoked the parent state to interdict their trade, and suspend the provincial charter of Massachusetts. The announcement of this measure was the signal for a rising from Maine to Georgia. A meeting of the disaffected was held at New York: a committee was organized; and from the pen, apparently, of Jay, one of its members, proceeded nearly the earliest proposal for a general congress. The result is well known. A congress met at Philadelphia in September, 1774. Jay represented his native city, New York. "He was in the twenty-ninth year of his age, and, it is believed, the youngest member of the house."—(vol. i. p. 30.) But he seems to have been more disposed to moderation than his elders. Though no man was more likely to rise to notoriety by turbulent attempts—though he was the author of the address of Congress to the people of Great Britain, a composition which "Jefferson, while still ignorant of the author, declared to be a production of the finest pen in America,"—yet the measure which he had most at heart was one which, if it did not prevent, might, as he hoped, excuse rebellion. "On the 8th of July," 1775, "Congress individually signed a petition to the King. This measure originated with Mr. Jay, and was carried by him against a very strong opposition in Congress." He "maintained that if the people were called to take up arms against their sovereign, they ought to be persuaded that such a measure was unavoidable, and that the conviction that no proper efforts to prevent such an event had been omitted, would reconcile the consciences of many to a course of conduct which would *otherwise* be inconsistent with their oaths of allegiance. The petition was lawful and respectful."—(vol. i. p. 36.) How Mr. Jay would have defended the "otherwise," which was such a peacemaker to his conscience, we pretend not to understand; but his scruples contrast well with the recklessness of many of his colleagues. Jefferson thus describes the petition:—"The disgust against its humility was general; and Mr. Dickinson's delight at its passage—(the petition had been of his drawing)—was the only circumstance which reconciled them to it. The vote being passed, he could not refrain from rising and expressing his satisfaction, and concluded by saying, 'there is but one word, Mr. President, in the paper which I disapprove, and that is the word *congress.*' On which Ben Harrison rose and said, 'There is but one word, Mr. President, of which I approve, and that is the word *congress.*'"

Little favour as Mr. Jay's scruples found with the violent partisans around him, they will recommend him to the esteem of good men in less turbulent times. Whether he was right in thinking rebellion necessary to the safety of himself and his fellow-countrymen—whether God's Providence could not have found a course for preventing oppression, without even a seeming violation of oaths—whether the most successful revolution is not germinant with its own punishment, while it is given to faith and patience to choose the good and refuse the evil; these are questions too large to be at present opened. One admission however we may freely make—that of all popular movements none admits of greater excuse than the American insurrection. There was but a single person in Great Britain who had any right to censure it; that person the one, whose conduct by a strange obliquity has been the subject of greatest complaint, the king. Nation against nation, and assembly against assembly—we think there was no just ground for the feeling in this country against America; a feeling which made the war as popular in its outset, as it was loathed in its consequences. A few words will explain our meaning.

The rights of Englishmen depend on a set of laws, written or verbal, some of them drawn from general principles of justice, and some from accidental peculiarities of our various forefathers. The basis of the constitution thus derived is not any express code which the nation has ratified, much less those principles of abstract right in which philosophers seldom agree, and which demagogues never respect, but—the only thing on which any durable liberty has been ever built—the principle of *prescription.* The British Constitution, like all other valuable social institutions, has grown gradually out of the arrangements of Providence, and was not developed by the hand of man. At this day our national security and happiness—the liberty which, as Englishmen, we yet retain—our freedom from the various discomforts which beset the republics of the new world, or the monarchies of the old—are attributable not to those bungling alterations which the social fabric underwent during the hurricane of 1833, but to the old institutions which outlived it. We are satisfied, not because of Lord John Russell's bill, but notwithstanding it. Even the American Constitution, strange to say, owes its present stability, not to the wisdom of its designers, but to that basis of ancient principle and practice on which it was reared. Transplanted to Mexico it has failed altogether.

The British legislature therefore is not designed to create new rights, but to enforce old ones. It is an authorized expositor of what *is* already the Constitution. This is shown by the very terms of the complaint so often heard, that proposed measures are unconstitutional. The expression implies some fixed basis which ought to be respected. In theory then the business of parliament is to apply old principles to new emergencies, not by virtue of any authority delegated to it by the people, but as being itself part of the prescriptive system which it maintains. To this the sounder part of the American colonists made no opposition. They allowed the Imperial Parliament to be the authoritative expositor of the ancient laws. Their quarrel lay properly with the people, not with the king—not with his Majesty and the three estates, but with the House of Commons.

Among the most beneficial of our political principles is that which guarantees private property, and ordains that whatever is needed for public purposes should be obtained, not by force, but by the voluntary concession of its owners. If any abstract principle were the basis of British rights it would unquestionably be Mr. Jay's favourite maxim that "those who own the country ought to govern it."—vol. i. p. 70. *Representation of property,* though it has no natural connection with the legislative power, is connected by usage with that of granting contributions. This it was on which the bulk of Americans insisted. They maintained that according to the theory of the British Constitution they ought to be taxed by their own assemblies. In this Lord Chatham supported them. "Parliament," he said, in 1766, "has no right to lay a tax upon the colonies. At the same time I assert the authority of this kingdom to be sovereign and supreme in any circumstance of government and legislature whatever. Taxation is no part of the governing or legislative power." The House of Commons and British nation judged differently; with them therefore the contest was waged, and it was their power which would have been increased by success.

The rights here assigned to the British legislature contrast curiously with those of a body to which in a measure it served as a model, the American Congress. The functions of these two legislative bodies have this difference, that Parliament *ought* not to change fundamental laws, and Congress *cannot*. The constitution however is often treated by Parliament as Holy Scripture by the Church of Rome; it is compelled to bear that meaning which is put upon it by the last enactments of the infallible body. In vain do the judges declare what was heretofore the authorized and constitutional notion; their decision goes for no more than the consent of antiquity with the papacy, the dictum of the living expositor is infallible. Parliament, says Lord Coke, can do any thing but make a man a woman or a woman a man. Not so the American Congress. It puts its meaning indeed upon the authorized constitution, but its decision may be reversed by a higher authority. The judges may declare its enactments to be inconsistent with the fundamental laws. It appeals to them, exactly as the Church of England does to the ancient Fathers, as an authority which it is not to guide but to follow. The judges therefore are evidently the great conservative point of the American Constitution; and much moment was attached to Washington's selection of a chief justice when he entered upon the office of President in 1788. His choice fell upon Jay.

Already had Mr. Jay displayed the integrity and decision which fitted him for such a post. After filling various offices at home, among them that of chief justice of the State of New York, he had been sent as ambassador from the United States to Spain. His familiarity with the French language may have pointed him out for this service, as we find that he had been employed in the very first intercourse between the colonies and a foreign power. This had occurred in the year 1775, one year only after the formation of the American Congress, and eight months before it ventured on the declaration of independence.

"About the month of November, Congress was informed that a foreigner was then in Philadelphia, who was desirous of making to them an important and confidential communication. This intimation having been several times repeated, a committee, consisting of Mr. Jay, Dr. Franklin and Mr. Jefferson, was appointed to hear what the foreigner had to say. These gentlemen agreed to meet him in one of the committee rooms in Carpenters' Hall. At the time appointed they went there, and found already arrived an elderly lame gentleman, having the appearance of an old wounded French officer. They told him they were authorized to receive his communication. Upon which he said, 'that his most Christian majesty had heard with pleasure of the exertions made by the American colonies in defence of their rights and privileges; that his majesty wished them success, and would, whenever it should be necessary, manifest more openly his friendly sentiments towards them.'

"The committee requested to know his authority for giving these assurances. He answered only by drawing his hand across his throat, and

> saying, ' Gentlemen, I shall take care of my head.' They then asked, what demonstration of friendship they might expect from the king of France. ' Gentlemen,' answered the foreigner, ' if you want arms you shall have them; if you want ammunition you shall have it; if you want money you shall have it!' The committee observed, that these assurances were indeed important, but again desired to know by what authority they were made. ' Gentlemen,' said he, ' repeating his former gesture, I shall take care of my head;' and this was the only answer they could obtain from him. He was seen in Philadelphia no more. It was the opinion of the committee that he was a secret agent of the French court, directed to give them indirect encouragement, but in such a manner that he might be disavowed if necessary. Mr. Jay stated that his communications were not without their effect on the proceedings of Congress."—vol. i. p. 39, 40.

Notwithstanding these assurances, the French government did not commit themselves to an acknowledgment of American Independence until after the capture of General Burgoyne at Saratoga in 1777, and Spain, at this time their close ally, was still slower in bestowing her sanction on colonial insurrection. But as Spain was now at war with England, the Americans naturally hoped for her co-operation, and Mr. Jay undertook to break ground there in 1779. After a disastrous voyage, he landed at Cadiz, January 22d 1780, "not only an entire stranger, but without letters of introduction or bills of credit."—p. 106.

His object when he reached Madrid was to obtain a loan from the Spanish government, and the difficulty of the task may be best estimated by the extremity of the need which dictated it.

> " Shortly after Mr. Jay's departure from America, Congress ordered bills to be drawn on him for more than half a million of dollars, payable six months after sight, in the hope that before that time he would have obtained a subsidy from the Spanish court. With these bills supplies were purchased for the army, and the holders sent them to their European correspondents, who presented them to Mr. Jay for payment. That Congress should have ventured on such a measure, not only without knowing that Mr. Jay could procure money in Spain, but even before they had heard of his arrival there, proves the desperate situation of their finances at the period of the revolution, and their conviction that the means of continuing the contest were to be provided for at every hazard. Similar bills were drawn upon Mr. Laurens, who had sailed as American minister for Holland; and unfortunately they arrived before the minister, who being captured by a British cruiser, was consigned to the Tower of London."—p. 108.

Confinement in the " towers of Julius" was not much worse than freedom at Madrid without money. Spain had not even recognized the existence of the United States, and as a previous condition she claimed the surrender of the navigation of the Mississipi; a sacrifice in which nothing could induce Jay to concur. The expedient which he adopted shall be stated in his son's words:

> " Anxious to save the credit of his country, and regardless of personal consequences, he now took a step no less remarkable for its boldness and decision, than for its variance with his usual habits of prudence. He resolved to accept all bills that should be presented to him, thus making himself personally responsible for their payment. This was done for the purpose of preserving the credit of the United States for at least the ensuing six months, and in the hope that within that time supplies would be obtained from either Spain or France. On the 22d of September his acceptances amounted to 50,000 dollars. He then applied to the French court for assistance, and was informed that none could be afforded. It was not long however before he received from France, through Dr. Franklin, 25,000 dollars. This relief, small as it was, revived his hopes, and strengthened the resolution he had taken, and he continued to accept every bill that was presented."—p. 109.

This willingness to run risks in the service of his country, contrasts strikingly with the prudence and frugality of Jay's personal habits; a frugality which Jefferson, if we rightly read his cypher,* seems to have thought a fit subject for a sneer, but which is obviously essential to the honest representative of a republic. Jay was now to fill this office in a yet more important scene. Relieved from his Spanish embarrassments by the success of Washington, he arrived at Paris in June, 1782, where, in conjunction with Mr. Adams and Dr. Franklin, he was empowered to conclude a peace with Great Britain.

One circumstance made this task peculiarly critical:—" When you come to find by your instructions," wrote Gouverneur Morris,† " that you must ultimately obey the dictates of the French Minister, I am sure there is something in your bosom, which will revolt at the servility of the situation."—p. 130. Congress, however, had acquiesced in this demand, and Mr. Jay's opposition to it seems to have been the ground of that bitter hatred which he ever afterwards experienced from the French party in the United States. Dr. Franklin submitted to it without reluctance, blinded, probably, by that hostility towards Great Britain which led him into the littleness of recalling private insults, when he appeared as the representative of a nation. But Jay, though his hereditary partialities might be supposed to favour the country of his ancestors, soon penetrated the designs of the French ministry. The independence of the United States once admitted by England, they would stand in no need of the assistance of France and Spain. The necessity of conciliating their allies would not thenceforth oblige them to continue the war, nor would they, as the price of independence, be compelled to accept a disadvantageous peace. To obtain a recognition, therefore, previous to the treaty, was the object of America; an object to which England, weary of the war, offered no opposition. What then was the obstacle? Mr. Jay suspected that it was raised by the French Minister of War, the Count de Vergennes. His suspicions were soon confirmed by an intercepted letter from M. Marbois, the French Chargé d'Affairs, at Philadelphia, which betrayed the purposes of the French government in delaying the negociation. Fresh proof was derived from the attempts of Vergennes's secretary to induce the negociators to forego the Newfoundland fisheries and the navigation of the Missisippi, and from a private mission of the same party to England. Convinced at length of the treachery* which was intended, Mr. Jay induced his colleagues to sign a private treaty with Great Britain without the consent of the French minister. "Eh bien, mon amie," said next day the Spanish ambassador at Paris, tapping him good naturedly on the shoulder, "vous avez très bien fait."

---

* Vide Jefferson's Memoirs, ii. 326.

† " A high-flying monarchy man," according to Jefferson; apparently because he did not choose to submit to the French party.

Notwithstanding the success of his diplomacy, Mr. Jay seems to have had little relish for the employment, and declining any further engagement of the same kind, he entered, May, 1784, upon the office of Foreign Secretary to Congress. He could scarcely have been placed in a position where the deficiencies of the Union were more apparent. The people refused to pay their private debts to the subjects of Great Britain, the several states supported them, while the general government had no power to enforce obedience, or to fulfil its engagements towards foreigners. It was at this time that Jay is asserted, though without truth, to have meditated the revival of monarchy in the United States. The idea is expressly negatived by his confidential correspondence with Washington. "Shall we have a king? Not in my opinion, while other expedients remain untried. Might we not have a Governor-General, limited in his prerogatives or duration? Might not Congress be divided into an Upper and a Lower House, the former appointed for life, the latter annually?"—vol. i. p. 256.

---

* Mr. Jay seems to have suspected a much deeper plot on the part of the French, amounting even to a partition of the United States. It rested on the authority of a "Mr. Pultney," probably Sir William Pulteney, who was at Paris with his daughter at the time he mentions. For "Mally" read Mallet.

"New-made greatness doth forget men's names."

It seems that Republicans are not exempt from ἡ λήθη των ονοματων παρὰ μικρὸν. We have Hartly for Hartley, vol. i. p. 71; Strackey for Strachey, Tankenville for Tankerville.

Of these proposals a large part was carried into effect when the present constitution of the United States was adopted in the year 1788, and the dissolution of the Union, if not prevented, has been at least deferred. Nothing is more creditable to those eminent men to whom the change was owing, than that the detestation of injustice contributed as largely to their attempt as the apprehension of anarchy. In 1785 Mr. Jay " presented to Congress an elaborate report, in which he entered into a minute examination of the acts of the several states, and showed conclusively that Massachusetts, Pensylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, and New York, had each been guilty of violating the provisions of the treaty" with Great Britain. "Congress, in accordance with the advice of their secretary, called on the States to repeal such of their laws as were repugnant to the treaty: but unhappily they had no power to enforce the call. There was no federal judicature to which the injured and oppressed foreigner could appeal for protection against the vindictive and unjust enactments of the state legislatures."—p. 239, 241.

A democracy has no conscience. " I think," said Washington, when the degrading conduct of the local governments was brought before him, that " there is more wickedness than ignorance mixed with our councils.—Virtue, I fear, has in a great degree taken its departure from our land, and the want of disposition to do justice is the source of the national embarrassments."—p. 244. This distrust of his countrymen was Washington's feeling* to the last, and it was not likely to be removed by the conduct of the legislature of his own state, when ten years later it instructed its representative, Monroe, to move for the abrogation of that " article of the treaty of peace, which secured to British creditors the right of recovering in the United States their honest debts."—p. 314. " We have probably had too good an opinion of human nature in forming our confederation" are his emphatic words.—p. 247. The sole remedy appeared to be a federal government, which should be less immediately dependant on the will of the majority. Such a measure was proposed in 1787 by a congress consisting of the ablest men in the United States. Jay contributed greatly to its success, as well by his personal exertions in the legislature of New York, as by his contributions to " The Federalist," a publication in which he was joined by Alexander Hamilton, the ablest, probably, of American statesmen, and by Maddison, who afterwards courted popular favour by reversing his present measures. Their united efforts were successful: the federal constitution was accepted; Washington became first President, and Jay Chief Justice.

From the duties of this important office he was called in 1794

* Vide Jefferson's Correspondence.

to undertake a special embassy to England. The fever of French revolutionism was at that moment raging in North America, and but for Washington's personal influence she would have been entangled in the hostilities of Europe. He was nobly seconded by Jay, who, in contempt of the threats and violence of the partisans of France, conducted his embassy with honesty and success, and obtained for his country the advantages of a commercial treaty with Great Britain. On the state of parties in England he looked with a discerning eye; he saw the great popularity of the king, and the hearty concurrence which the nation gave to the war with France.—vol. ii. pp. 247, 250. His own inclinations, as he explains them to Washington, were favourable to those proposals for a negociation with France, which were made in parliament during his stay in London, and were productive of the conferences at Lisle.

> " The minister would, I think, have stood on stronger ground if he had taken the first good opportunity of saying explicitly in the House of Commons that it was France who declared war against Great Britain, and not Great Britain who declared war against France, and that the government was disposed and ready to make peace, whenever France would do it on terms compatible with honour, &c."—vol. ii. p. 249.

Mr. Jay was well received in England; Lord Grenville treated him with marked attention; and some of the most interesting letters in these volumes are from persons with whom he became acquainted in London. On his return to America in June, 1795, public reasons induced him to exchange his situation as Chief Judge for the less lucrative office of Governor of New York. To this post he had been elected some years before, but had been excluded by a political manœuvre,—falsification of votes,—on the part of the democrats.

Of his own high-minded repugnance to such practices,—the distinguishing merit of his character,—he gave a signal instance while Governor of New York. John Adams had by that time succeeded Washington in the Presidential chair, but with the political principles had not inherited the influence of his predecessor. Temporary circumstances, also, had alienated some of his partisans, so that the Presidential election in 1800 seemed likely to bring in Jefferson and anti-federalism. A greater evil could scarcely be inflicted on a nation than to place this bad man, a " fanatic in politics and infidel in religion," in its highest office. But from the equal division of other votes, it soon appeared that the result would depend upon New York, which, by leaving the appointment of Presidential electors to its local assembly, gave its whole influence commonly to a single candidate. At this critical moment the Federalists lost their preponderance in the annual election for the New York legislature. One resource only was open to them. Some months must elapse before the new assembly would come into existence, while the old one, though its session had expired, was not extinct. If reassembled by the governor it could transfer the appointment of presidential electors from the state legislature to the people in districts, always a popular measure, and the division of votes thus produced would be almost as fatal to Jefferson as their concentration against him.

No appeal could be more trying than that made on this occasion to the governor. Providence seemed to have put in his hands his country's preservation. He was too good a man to be influenced by the personal hatred entertained for him by Jefferson, but he must have anticipated the various evils which resulted from a systematic attempt to undo what Washington and himself had effected. His conduct in other instances, more especially his opposition during the following year to the encroachments upon his legitimate authority, shows that he was not actuated by pusillanimity, and it is impossible therefore not to honour him for rejecting the proposal to reassemble the local legislature, as being, in his own words, " a measure for party purposes, which it would " not become me to adopt."—vol. i. p. 414.

If such an example were needed anywhere it was under a republican government, of which the inherent vice is its want of fixed principles. When the voice of the people is admitted to be the voice of God, what human institutions can be too sacred to be assailed, or what divine laws? Reason and authority are equally unavailing, when the last decision of the majority is the standard of equity. It were well if this affected only the political arrangements of a republic, if such changes as that which Jay at this time prevented, and which twenty-four years afterwards,* under somewhat similar circumstances, he lived to witness, were alone to be apprehended. But it is the tendency of democracies to trample on natural as well as civil rights; to alter the standard of justice as well as of law. Of this the United States have given sufficient indication. It was one of their cardinal principles, (Jefferson brings it forward with no little éclat,) that the king did not possess the right which the usage of England gave him, to grant allotments of the unoccupied soil of the colonies. " All the lands, " they said, within the limits which any society has circumscribed " around itself are assumed by that society, and subject to its " allotment." (*Jeff. Memoirs*, i. 117.) That the crown of England possessed any right to dispose of the countries of which its subjects took possession we do not maintain; in this case the usage of Christendom is manifestly oppressive. But did the Americans abide by their declaration of rights? Their own new charters were hardly dry when they compelled the Indians to sell, at a nominal price, the territory of which their "particular society" had been in possession for countless centuries; so that in the same pages with this Bill of Rights to the American soil may be found Jefferson's concurrence in its infraction. (*Jeff.* i. 309.) The very debt incurred by the Americans in maintaining their own lands was thus paid by means of the expulsion of others. We are not at present concerned with the injustice of this, but with its inconsistency. Other cases (that of the Cherokees) might be more openly oppressive, but the calmness with which recent principles were forgotten best illustrates the habits of the animal called Democracy.

---

* Vide Basil Hall's North America.

Jefferson's correspondence makes us acquainted with another example of the same kind. When Lousiana was ceded to the United States, its French inhabitants desired the same liberty which the British government had left to the Canadians whom it had conquered—the right of using their own laws. Perhaps the Canadians were too indulgently treated, yet the principle of interfering as little as possible with private liberty was excellent. But what said President Jefferson, whose whole life had been spent in maintaining the right of the several states to self-government. Through his creature, the Governor, he disallowed the decision of the local legislature, and proposed to swamp the French majority by settling 30,000 American volunteers within the limits which they had "circumscribed around" themselves. (*Jeff. Mem.* iv. 65.) The laws of nature would then doubtless have regained their authority, and the sentence of the majority would have been once more the voice of God.

These remarks proceed from no hostility to America, where there are as many probably who disapprove the injustice of the majority as in Great Britain. The popular unfairness is not their fault, but their misfortune. They are the more to be pitied because their very opinions are under bondage. They have not even the privilege to complain. We know nothing more galling to a generous mind than to be compelled to assent to the shallow sophisms of the vulgar, to restrain its thoughts to that sluggish motion with which inferior spirits can keep pace, and to submit to be the "man of the age." It is from the humiliation thus imposed on its public servants that the statesmen of America afford so lamentable a contrast to the heroes of its revolution. Not that we can trace its effect on individual character, but we think the Americans themselves cannot review the generation which sprang up in more independent habits of thought without perceiving the degeneracy. " Memoriam quoque ipsam cum voce perdidissemus si tam in nostra potentia esset oblivisci quam tacere."

The life of Jay affords many bitter traces of this feeling. And we are ourselves too near the danger to overlook them. Already do our republican periodicals insult us by the assumption that those who differ from the rabble must either be dishonest or infatuate. Let a man dissent from the popular cant of this shallow age, no matter how deeply conversant with the thoughts of the mightiest spirits of our race, no matter how refined his taste, how extensive his knowledge, how elevated his genius, and the pedants of the Mechanics' Institute will at once pronounce that he is of narrow and limited understanding. Now this assuredly is but the yell of the savage before he begins his work of blood. Were the majority really on the side of the liberty-mongers of the day, to differ from them would involve a bodily as well as a mental persecution. During the madness of the Reform Bill it was as dangerous for a Tory to vote in Roxburgshire as for a negro at Philadelphia, witness the motto of the Minto family, " Burke Sir Walter;" and the House of Commons has just shown that if men are not murdered as well as insulted during the next election, it will not be for want of impunity. As yet neither O'Connell nor the Lord Advocate have carried matters so far as the enlightened citizens of Missouri, and Lynch law has been more effective than Jedburg justice. But that it may be well understood to what point things are tending, we give, in parallel columns, a scene at Philadelphia and in the county of Limerick.

" I said one day to an inhabitant of Pennsylvania, ' Be so good as to explain to me how it happens that in a state founded by Quakers, and celebrated for its toleration, freed Blacks are not allowed to exercise civil rights. They pay the taxes: is it not fair that they should have a vote?'

" ' You insult us,' replied my informant, ' if you imagine that our legislators could have committed so gross an act of injustice and intolerance.'

" ' What, then the Blacks possess the right of voting in this country?'

" ' Without the smallest doubt.'

" ' How comes it then that in the polling-booth this morning I did not perceive a single negro in the whole meeting?'

" At the opening of the Limerick County Court this day, a fourth candidate was put in nomination. The great body of farmers and peasantry arrived about 10 o'clock, exhibiting a demonstration of physical strength and of martial organization never exceeded at any contest for the representation of Limerick. The countrymen came regularly marshalled by their leaders, respectable farmers on horseback. The Roman Catholic priests were conspicuous before each troop.

" The booths were opened about 10 o'clock, but scarce a tally was entered for any candidate when a desperate assault was made upon Mr. Stafford O'Brien's committee-room with sticks, stones, and brickbats; the porters at

"'This is not the fault of the law; the negroes have an undisputed right of voting; but they voluntarily abstain from making their appearance.'

"'A very pretty piece of modesty on their parts, rejoined I.'

"'Why the truth is that they are not disinclined to vote, but they are afraid of being maltreated: in this country the law is sometimes unable to maintain its authority without the support of the majority. But in this case the majority entertains very strong prejudices against the Blacks, and the magistrates are unable to protect them in the exercise of their legal privileges.'

"'What, then the majority claims the right not only of making the laws, but of breaking the laws it has made?'" *Tocqueville's America. Reeve's Translation.*

the entrance were both knocked down, and the gentlemen of the committee received several violent blows from missiles and sticks now put in requisition by the storming party. The police charged to the rescue with fixed bayonets, and relieved the gentlemen and agents of Mr. O'Brien from their imminently perilous situation, or otherwise, in a few minutes, there is no doubt they would each and all have been sacrificed by the sanguinary miscreants, whose object was evidently slaughter on the instant.

"Mr. L. O'Brien withdrew from the contest, and would not prosecute a poll when his agents and voters were in peril of their lives. It was understood that he was at this moment in a majority in the morning's poll."—*Times, Aug.* 14, 1837.

In neither of these cases has there been any attempt to remedy so monstrous a state of things; "he that is in the lion's clutches knows it were useless." The Whigs continue to descant on the peace, order, and happiness of Ireland under the Mulgrave rule, as though the enormity we have described had been in one of his lordship's novels, not in a county which he was bound to protect; the perfect equality of their unrivalled constitution remains the favourite subject of congratulation at Philadelphia.

That a happier state of things as yet prevails in this country is owing, under Providence, to two causes—local institutions and an endowed Church. Did space permit, a curious contrast might be drawn between the conduct of our republicans in endeavouring to disturb our local liberties, and the opposition of the American democrats to centralization. The cause is the same, different as is the effect. The central government in America is less subject to the immediate control of the populace than the local legislatures; our agitators find officials in London more flexible than the independent institutions which have hitherto ramified through the national frame. Hence the wish or attempt to subject the magistracy and police to the home office, to put a minister of public instruction over schools, to abandon the poor to the three kings of Somerset House; political privileges being the alleged gain, the real loss, personal freedom.

But we turn to that, to which the work before us invites, the national effect of our ecclesiastical institutions. The good man whose life is detailed in these volumes had been brought up a churchman, and in the Episcopal communion he died. In 1801 he retired from public life, glad apparently to escape from the overbearing tyranny of the prevalent demagogues, and fixed himself in a retired situation about fifty miles from New York. Here the newspapers could reach him but once a week to remind him of "the vanity of expecting that from the perfectibility of human nature and the lights of philosophy, the multitude will become virtuous and wise or their demagogues candid and honest." (vol. i. p. 431.) "As to myself," he says in an interesting letter to Mr. Wilberforce, "both gratitude and resignation have strong claims to my attention. To find myself at this period of my life, and after so many years spent in affairs which naturally caused solicitude, placed by Providence in my present tranquil comfortable situation, is particularly grateful to my feelings." After mentioning some domestic trials, he resumes, "to *you* it will be an obvious reflection, that checkered scenes belong to a state of probation: and that being here as birds on their passage, this is not the proper place for us to build our nests."—vol. i. p. 432.

He had formed a right estimate of the only durable possession which man can raise, when he was "instrumental in erecting an Episcopal Church" in the neighbourhood of his new dwelling. And here it is natural to observe the source of that temper and moderation which marked his course. Whether men believe in religion or not—whether they suppose it but the disguise which is assumed in public, or are acquainted with its private benefits—yet that it does in fact exercise large influence over mankind is what cannot be controverted. Be it their weakness or their wisdom, men are bound together by the tie of a common faith, and its absence is a diminution of their national identity. When it is asked, then, why Jay, not of English ancestry, whose family had undergone real suffering from despotic power, displayed a fairness and moderation so unusual around him, we answer, that he was a member of the English Church. Had this "cheap defence of nations" taken firmer root, the battle of Bunker's Hill would never have been fought, nor Washington sacked by a hostile armament.

Yet it must not be supposed that Jay was a well-instructed Churchman. How could he be so? The Church of England had indeed spread her branches over her colonies, but she had never taken root there. He admits, indeed, "that Episcopacy was of Apostolic institution"—vol. i. p. 435; but of the real office of a bishop he seems to have been about as ignorant as our countrymen of the privileges of a Mohawk chieftain. And what else could be expected? Had he been taught to regard the Bishops of the Church Catholic as the highest depositories of those mystic gifts, which it has pleased the Lord of all to commit to "earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power" might still be His? Had he learnt in youth to reverence the Apostolic office, by being brought at Confirmation into personal union with the whole system of the Church? What wonder if an American should think but little of an institution which had never shown itself on his native soil? If he should be ignorant that men, of whom he had heard but as lords of parliament, were in truth the successors of the Apostles? It is not strange, then, that he should have objected to the terms in which they were addressed by the American clergy as too "reverential," i. 253; or that he should have known no difference between the self-deputed Episcopacy of Denmark, and that which can trace its origin to the twelve disciples. All this is explained as naturally as the phenomenon so gravely set forth by Reid and Matthison in their visit to the (so called) American Churches, that while the Episcopal communion was endowed in Virginia its numbers declined, and that its revival might be dated from the plunder of its revenues. But under what circumstances did its numbers decline? Was it an Apostolic community, such as Ignatius would have recognized, or to which the exhortations of St. John might have been addressed? Alas, its rites had never been fully solemnized—the young had never known the ordinance by which the benefits of baptism are recalled—the congregation never met under consecrated roof—the dead did not lie in a hallowed soil! The light might indeed be there, but instead of being in its candlestick, it was laid under a bushel. We know with what scorn such arguments are received by the scoffer and the infidel, but we beg leave to remind them, that were religion as false as their own shallow ethics, yet not Hume or Carlisle can deny that the majority of men profess to believe it; and further, that, as members of the Church, we are not called upon to account for phenomena except upon her principles. Inasmuch, then, as the Church of Christ has ever held the bishop to be the centre of all spiritual union, and that the gifts of grace are disseminated through him over the mystic body, she does not teach us to expect that a branch could flourish which had never been truly rooted in the soil. To this state of things succeeded the revolutionary war; the bitterness of politics was added to that of schism; and such was the hostility towards those families which were by position most connected with the English Church, that "at this day," says Jefferson in 1813, "unpopularity continues attached to their names. A Randolph, a Carter, or a Burwell, must have great personal superiority over a common competitor to be elected by the people."—*Jefferson's Cor.*

At length the infection of English alliance passed away. We rejoice to find the Virginian Church flourishing like a palmtree, though Messrs. Reid and Matthison can extract gall from its healing branches. We do not stop to say more of their work, though we must observe the unfairness of a comparison between the number of communicants in a church where the Eucharist is constantly administered according to the usage of early times, and a society where the communion is a profession of faith rather than a mean of spiritual blessing. To hasten to our immediate subject, the national influence of a Church independent by its endowments of popular caprice, and exempted by its Episcopal order from popular control. Of all preservatives of liberty, none is more important than the barrier thus formed against any sudden movement of the popular will. The insulation of a large portion of the most cultivated part of society from the ordinary current, its addiction to pursuits which lie apart from men's daily business, affords a constant corrective to those impulses by which the popular mind is led astray. It is the lake which moderates the else overflowing ebullitions of the tide of life---the fly-wheel which gives stability to the irregular impulses of society. Opinions receive gradually a new stamp—politicians learn the effect of principles—even political economists acquire wisdom. When can this be more clearly evidenced than in North America? That a species of religion prevails in that country we do not question. Men cannot live in comfort without some faith which may enable them to die. But its religious system is the disciple, not the instructress of the people. It does not lead, but follow. It is but the echo of their voice—how can it alter the tide by which it is borne? Is there a crime, like the oppression of their negro brethren, which is sanctioned by the law of the multitude;---Christianity shuts herself up for a season like Tamerlane while the streets of Aleppo were flowing with blood, and discusses abstract questions instead of checking the excesses of her subjects.

"Frangimur heu fatis inquit, ferimurque procella.
Nec plura locutus
Sepsit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas."

Whence comes it that in "religious America," when excesses have been committed, worse than the massacre at Thessalonica, no St. Ambrose has arisen to control the people? It was a natural complaint in the civil authority, "there is no bringing a people to justice;" but where was the Church, which is bound by its office to war with the passions of the multitude?

That the Church of this country has often withstood a popular delusion, we learn from the confession of its enemies. In 1833, the majority of the clergy, though anxious to see the representative system freed from corruption, yet opposed the reckless and unnecessary violation of private rights and established usage.

In the popular publications of that day, the clergy, we must all remember, were charged with setting themselves in opposition to the public will, and were menaced with the national vengeance. Now that the delusion has passed away, the clergy are but the more respected for their independence. What is the history of the Non-jurors—the best part of our Church during the last century—but a refusal to partake in popular crimes? We doubt not that there are those in America, who would be equally willing to witness for the truth by their private sufferings, but how could they bear the same testimony against national apostacy? It is the existence of a priesthood neither immediately dependent on popular bounty, nor amenable to popular will, which alone can produce this salutary effect. Some real independence is wanted—not that of the Congregational Union—a sect which, by a strange anomaly, has adopted the name, because its teachers are *not* independent, just as those call themselves baptists, whose children are *not* baptised.

Strange it is that to the blessings which such an institution has conferred on this country, our colonies have not been admitted. There was a time, indeed, when something better might have been hoped. In the year 1713, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel expressed its belief, that during the next year two bishops would be settled in our Western Colonies. What had happened during the previous thirteen years since Dr. Bray had given birth to an interest in the cause of missions, might at that moment have warranted expectations of the most sanguine success. But the next year saw power conferred upon a party systematically opposed to the extension of the Church. While the star of Walpole was in the ascendant, while Hoadley predominated over the clergy, what efforts could be expected? Sir Robert Walpole is said to have declared, that he did not venture on so dangerous an experiment as that of taxing the colonies, but he took a surer mode of destroying their attachment to the mother state, when he prevented the enterprising Berkeley from making the Bermudas the focus of their religious and intellectual growth. Unhappily during that very period, when the moral blight of latitudinarian indifference overspread the land, did the colonial system of Great Britain receive its direction. It bore token to the unwholesome atmosphere around it. So deep rooted was the evil that its very propriety was hardly questioned, and even Secker could consent to withhold the advantage of Church offices from the continent of America, if the attempt was supposed to be hostile to the administration of the day. For more than half a century did this state of things continue, and it was not till the celebrated resolutions which were moved by Mr. Wilberforce, in

1793, that the duty of a Christian government towards its dependences was even in form admitted.

The public judgment is now happily improved. But any efficient attempts to evangelize our wide-spread empire, are as much prevented as ever by sectarian jealousy. What indifference did in the last century, is done in this by misdirected zeal. That even the Dissenters ought not, on their own principles, to oppose a systematic attempt for the foundation of the Church throughout our wide dominions—that their jealousy is little less unreasonable on their own principles than on ours, we may show on some other occasion. Meanwhile let us express our deep regret that our own rulers are still forgetful of that simplest of all truths, that Churches, like individuals, must live by FAITH. The Ministry and the Radicals have agreed between them, it seems, that no provision shall be made for a bishop in Lower Canada. But does not Canada contain Christian souls in the unity of our Church? Ought they to be deprived of the blessings of ancient order? Such an income is not provided as befits a lord—but is a nation to be without its Apostle? Cannot He who founded the Church raise up friends for its support, or can no munificence be expected till men have ceased to be Christians? Where had been our own succession, if such cowardly policy had prevailed? Our ministers cannot be more careless about the Church than a well-remembered ruler at Corinth, and among its peddling Jews must have been many a forgotten maligner no less bitter than the member for Kilkenny. When will the time come that the Church of England, the noblest institution which it has pleased God to exhibit to mankind, shall go forth without fear upon its appointed task—trusting to its commission, not its wealth—not to acts of parliament, but to the precepts of its Founder—and determined that British speech and British law shall not be more widely spread over the globe, than its own sacred deposit—the everlasting line of the Apostles?

Art. VII.—*The Prose Works of the Right Rev. Father in God Thomas Ken, D.D., some time Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells; to which are added some of his Letters (never before published), and a short account of his Life.* By William Hawkins, Esq., his Executor. The whole collected by James Thomas Round, B.D., Rector of St. Runwald's and St. Nicholas, Colchester, and late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. Parker, Oxford. Albin, Colchester. 1838.

It is one of the greatest comforts remaining to us in these days of novelty and excitement, to reflect that we are not yet so far advanced in modern enlightenment as to be blind to the wisdom of the ages which have gone before us. Every month is discovering to us fresh stores from the piety and zeal of our forefathers. Many are yet left who are thoughtful enough to perceive that our advancement in secular and religious knowlege has been in an inverse ratio. Yet there is a difficulty in finding those who, having been brought up under the existing system of religious education and religious practice, shall stand up single-handed to protest against it. We have great reason, therefore, to be sincerely thankful to those, who in these days of degeneracy and defection, instead of timidly or indolently acquiescing in low views and careless practice, have marked out for themselves the delightful task of examining the writings and studying the example of those fathers and confessors of our Church whose principles and conduct have come nearest to a realization of its acknowledged theory. The dead may thus stand up as censors and correctors with better effect than the living, and as their works are from time to time rescued from oblivion, they seem raised as it were from the grave to rebuke us. We are divided in the present age between a restless spirit of innovation, which outstrips all rules, and a timid acquiescence in existing practice; we either take things as we found them, or, dissatisfied with them as we found them, we try to frame them to our own fancies. We contrive thus to reconcile ourselves to the loss of catechetical instruction, to the disuse of the daily service, to the scanty opportunities afforded still in many places for the Holy Communion, to the want of Church discipline, and to the most flagrant encroachments of Erastianism—partly by contemplating the difficulties which stand in the way of a sounder practice, and partly by reflecting how wants have often providentially been supplied, and dwelling on points in which our system has, on the whole, though in spite of itself, worked well. Still the question is, whether we are concerned to maintain the real theory of the Church of England, or are to be contented with confirming precedents, however old and numerous, which must be seen to be deviations from that theory. If she assumes a general system of catechetical instruction,—if she provides a morning and evening sacrifice of prayer and praise, and enjoins frequent communion,—if, again, she laments her want of discipline, and even assumes its existence in all her occasional services,—and if she holds a theory of alliance with the state, which is not Erastian, however inveterately her practice may have been so; in all these cases we surely are bound to uphold her acknowledged theory, so far as we can, to strive to realise it in our measure; and where we cannot, where we are obliged to acquiesce in evils which we cannot remedy, where we cannot be active but must be passive, we are still nevertheless concerned not to defend, but to protest firmly and temperately against prescriptive abuses, and instead of casting about for reasons why this or that privilege may be dispensed with, or devising new methods of our own for removing confessed difficulties, to look back, as we have said, to those who have most fully understood our Church, and most nearly realised its system, and who by their works and their example call us back to the faith and practice of our forefathers, and challenge our firm and affectionate allegiance to the ancient Church of England.

Of these perhaps there is no one who will be seen to speak and exhort and rebuke us with all authority more effectively than Bishop Ken;—no one who comes more nearly up to the character of a Christian Bishop, of being " blameless, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach, patient," and most entirely disinterested; nor perhaps can there be found a more perfect " example to the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity." We believe that there is no character from whose life and writings we could more fully and literally exemplify every single point in these passages than that of Bishop Ken. We know of none more keenly alive to the importance of his sacred office, and the necessity of preserving the " depositum," that good thing committed to him, and yet who entered more minutely into the lowest and simplest practical duties of the Christian ministry.

We have been glad, therefore, on many accounts, to hear his name revived amongst us, to find his example quoted, and, more especially, now, to see a collection of his Prose Works.

We have been much struck also at finding, on the same table with them at the booksellers, a work of Ken's intimate friend, Bishop Turner, of which we never before have heard;—a memoir of the excellent Nicholas Ferrar, of Little Gidding; and we cannot refrain from making a few remarks on the fact, that the works of two old and dear friends, who began life together, who rose together to the same high office, should have been brought to light again within a few months of each other, and be found side by side after having lain more than a century in neglect and obscurity. The two books, from the very nature of their subjects, are not unlikely in many instances to fall into the same hands,—and a few words on the friendship which subsisted between them may be interesting, though we have no intention of entering further into the works of Bishop Turner, and purpose to confine ourselves to remarks on those of Bishop Ken.

Ken has been long with us, and has been daily in the mouths of many who have known little or nothing more than his name. His Morning and Evening Hymns have been even adopted by almost universal consent into our Churches, and have crept, we know not how, in fragments, into the end of our Prayer-Books. His "Manual for the Use of Winchester Scholars" has been on the list of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge probably from the very time when that venerable Society was founded under the good auspices of men who well knew and loved the author, and admired the deep and natural piety which shone so conspicuously in his life and breathes throughout his works. His "Directions for Prayer for the Diocese of Bath and Wells," taken from the Church Catechism, have been preserved on the same lists, though the small demand for them would argue that they have either been unknown or forgotten, or, at all events, very far less valued and understood than they deserve. His name too is known to many of us, as connected with that of Robert Nelson, the prayers in whose "Practice of true Devotion" breathe very much the same tone with many of Ken's, and who has adopted into that work the Morning, and Evening, and Midnight Hymns. A few years since, a small but fair Selection was made from his other poems, but we are not aware whether the impression was a large one, or whether it has been extensively sold.

Ken, then, has been known, and long held in esteem amongst us. He is remembered also as one of the famous Seven Bishops who were imprisoned by King James, and as one of the nine Non-juring bishops who were afterwards deprived by William. But both his works and his character are far less known than they should be. The "Short Account of his Life, with the two Sermons," published in the beginning of the last century by his executor, has become very rare. His work on the Church Catechism, his "Prayers for the use of the Bath," and "Pastoral Discourse for Lent," have been long well nigh forgotten. We are therefore sincerely thankful to those who have collected his writings, and have added such further information respecting him, and furnished us with such original documents as may tend to raise a deep interest in his character, and to throw light on parts of it which have been from time to time misinterpreted or inadequately understood.

Of Bishop Turner we know but little. We have, indeed, seen some sermons of his, preached on public occasions, and we have heard or read of others; in particular, that he preached the Coronation sermon of King James II. and his Queen, a circumstance which probably ever after gave him so eager and zealous an interest in the fate of his Royal Master. But before we took up the little memoir of Ferrar, to which we have alluded, and which we suppose to have been until very lately in private hands, we knew nothing of any other production of his pen. We know him, chiefly, as the early and attached friend of Bishop Ken. They were together as boys at Winchester; they were admitted, within a year of each other, as Fellows of New College—Turner in 1655, and Ken in 1657. They were consecrated within a year of each other; Turner, in 1683, to the bishoprick of Rochester, from whence he was translated, in 1684, to Ely,—and Ken, in 1684, to the bishoprick of Bath and Wells. They were both speakers in the remarkable conversation which took place between King James and the Seven Bishops, on their delivery of their famous petition against his Declaration of indulgence. They became, in consequence, fellow-prisoners in the Tower, and they both finally underwent the unrighteous sentence of deprivation for refusing to take the new oaths of allegiance to William and Mary, on the 1st of February, 1690. Although their views, after this, differed, and they took distinct courses, as their characters widely differed, we know of no interruption of their long and sincere attachment; and it is remarkable that two friends so united should form representatives of the two distinct classes of Nonjurors.

Ken is always regarded as the meekest and most peaceful; Turner is known as the most stirring and active of the deprived bishops. Ken is known as having been strongly opposed to the carrying on of the succession by clandestine consecrations. Turner was vigorous in forwarding those measures which were adopted for that purpose. He was the bishop who drew the attention of his brethren to the papers of Dr. Barwick, in which the plans had been laid down for continuing the Apostolical Succession in England, as the sees had gradually become vacant during the great Rebellion, and on which Bishop Lloyd, of Norwich, acted, when, under what they considered like difficulties, he determined, with some of his brethren, to continue the succession.

Ken was from the first entirely averse to those political views which, from time to time, influenced others; and when, soon after the Revolution, on one occasion, the hopes of the Jacobites seemed to be reviving, he was most anxious to discourage and check them. He knew that principles had been then admitted, the fruits of which would remain for posterity, and which no political changes could correct; and he declared with great earnestness and concern, we are told, as under a sort of divine impulse, that it was then but "the beginning of evils." The vigorous and warm heart of Turner, on the other hand, involved him in great difficulties. He was in such constant and close communication with Henry Lord Clarendon, that he was suspected of being engaged with him in a plot for the restoration of the King; and so far, it seems, with reason, that he exposed not only himself but his brethren to the suspicious jealousy of the government, and was obliged to abscond. Ken retired almost immediately to the hospitable and quiet asylum offered him by Lord Weymouth at Long Leate. We know, indeed, that in the first instance he retired to his diocese to avoid appearing in the House of Lords; but we find from the diary of Lord Clarendon, that, on his return to London, he joined his friends and companions in trouble. Towards the end of the year 1689, and in the beginning of the year 1690, we find him with the Bishop of Ely at Lambeth Palace; he was probably staying with his friend Turner at Ely House, the bishop's town residence; and at his country house at Putney, where we find occasionally the deprived Bishops of Norwich, Gloucester, and Peterborough, and Lord Clarendon and the excellent Charles Leslie. But he saw enough, probably, of the questions which from time to time were mooted, to render him glad to escape from such controversies, and to withdraw to his retreat in the country. Turner probably remained chiefly in London and its neighbourhood with Bishop Lloyd. He was one of the three consecrators of Bishops Hickes and Wagstaffe, a ceremony which took place at Bishop White's lodgings (the deprived Bishop of Peterborough), at Southgate, in February, 1693, on St. Mathias's Eve. He is mentioned also in company with Bishop Lloyd, together with forty non-juring clergy, attending the funeral of their deprived brother of Peterborough, at the Church of St. Gregory's by St. Paul's, in June, 1698. His sympathies were clearly more with these than with his old friend Ken, but he is said to have reflected much on many points in his life, and to have been so sincere as to condemn himself in those instances in which he conceived he had acted unworthily of his sacred order and station, before his death, which took place in the year 1700.

We have interesting evidence remaining of the anxiety of the two friends respectively to influence each other. We are informed that Ken, who saw, no doubt, the difficulties on both sides, was at one time half persuaded by his friend Hooper, then rector of Lambeth, to take the oaths; and the conversations between them took place at the time when such frequent conferences were being held amongst the deprived bishops, hard by, at the palace. His situation between the palace and the rectory must have been truly painful and perplexing. He subsequently withdrew from Dr. Hooper's, which he had made his home after the Revolution, to his diocese; and it was during his absence that Bishop Turner, whom he had at length made his confidant, wrote the following anxious letter to the archbishop, dated Ascension Day, 1689:

"When I took my leave yesternight, I had no thought of waiting upon you again till this day sennight; but when I came home I found a letter to Mrs. Gregg from the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and this advertisement in it for me—'Tell my friend I will meet him at dinner at Lambeth, upon Saturday.' I suppose he does not know your Grace has left off dining publicly, as you have great reason to do. But since, my lord, you are pleased to give every one of your sons a day, as you obligingly express it, I must needs say the sooner we meet our brother of Bath the better, for I must no longer in duty conceal it from your Grace, tho' I beseech you to keep it in terms of a secret, that this very good man is, I fear, warping from us and the true interest of the Church of England, towards a compliance with the new government. I received an honest letter from him, and a friendly one, wherein he argues very wrong to my understanding, but promises and protests he will keep himself disengaged till he debates things over again with us, and that he was coming up again for that purpose. My Lord Bishop of Norwich has seen such another letter from him to my Lord of Gloucester; and upon the whole matter, our Bishop of Norwich, if your Grace thinks fit, will meet us on Saturday. I must needs wish my Lord of Chichester would be there to help us, for it would be extremely unhappy should we at this pinch lose one of our number. I apprehend that parson of Lambeth has superfined upon our brother of B. and W., and if he lodges again at his house, I shall doubt the consequence, for which reason I'll come over on Saturday morning to invite him to my country house."

Such was the array of powers drawn up by Bishop Turner to meet the scruples of his friend. The result is well known; Ken's single eye withstood the casuistry of his friend Hooper, who never ventured again to urge him on the subject; and we can see from the letters which Ken wrote some years after, when the question of "abjuration" came on, that his sentiments remained unaltered.

On the other hand, it appears from the letters to Hickes, now first published, that Ken had often and often lamented to his brother of Ely the continuance of the schism; and that after Turner's death, he urged the same arguments to Hickes.

Such, however, were the views respectively of Ken and Turner, and the connection between them; and the account we have given of the latter will make such a narrative as that now published, of the primitive discipline and orderly devotion which was observed in the family at Little Gidding, doubly interesting. We are, indeed, unable in most cases to determine where the original narrator ends, and where the editor, who has connected and methodized the memoirs, begins: nor do we know at what period of his life Bishop Turner wrote them, nor whence he obtained his materials; as the death of Ferrar, in 1637, must have been just about coincident with the birth of his biographer. But the bishop comes before us in a new light altogether, when we find him no longer the animated and eager non-juror, but the quaint and simple historian of a life spent in seclusion and devotion, counting the hours of worship, and minutely describing the prayers and praises of this quiet Christian household. For Little Gidding, which we have hitherto been acquainted with through the account of Dr. Peckard, "was in England, it has been observed, what Port-Royal was in France. Ardent devotion to the Redeemer characterized both. In each, peace, charity, good order, love to the souls and bodies of men, were eminently exhibited; upon each the hand of persecution fell with unrelenting severity." We have said, we know not how the mind of Turner was directed to this subject, but we think that both the choice of the subject itself, and the way in which it is treated, have thrown a new light on the character of the narrator. There is in those parts, which are expressly quoted as Turner's, a delightful quaintness, and honesty, and good sense; and a reality which compels us to think him in full earnest when he declares his conviction that the devout and holy life of Ferrar was "not only admirable but imitable." We may rejoice to think how fully he would see the meek wisdom, the retired and tranquil spirit, the wakeful, regular, and fervent piety, the rigid self-denial and overflowing charity of Ferrar, realized in the character and life of his own dear friend and companion Ken, and might dwell on the careful discipline and cheerful primitive devotion of this English Port Royal, as a model for that little Communion in which he felt so deep an interest amidst the enmity and persecution which assailed it—the Communion of the Non-jurors.

The substance, however, of Bishop Turner's book, we leave to others; our more immediate concern is with Bishop Ken. "The greater part of the following collection," Mr. Round tells us, in his preface, "was published in separate pieces by Bishop

Ken in his lifetime. Two of the sermons were printed after his death by his great nephew and executor, Mr. Hawkins. Some of the letters were printed for the first time by the Rev. W. L. Bowles in his life of the bishop. The rest of them were never published before. Some of these were in the possession of the Rev. Dr. Williams, Head Master of Winchester College, and some were in the Bodleian Library." And all of them are in various ways of great interest and value. Mr. Round expresses his fears that some of the remains of Bishop Ken have escaped his inquiries, and proceeds to mention several works which he has excluded from the collection as spurious. He has prefixed to the collection the "Short Account" of Ken's Life, by Hawkins. Of the omitted works, whether genuine or spurious, we will say a few words presently.

But we cannot help, in the first place, expressing our regret that Mr. Round, instead of merely prefixing the " Short Account" of Hawkins, should not have given us a more full view of the life and character and principles of Bishop Ken. We have said that he seems as literally and entirely to illustrate the Scripture characteristics of a Christian bishop as any one of whom we know; that he is one whose character is one of singular importance in these days of degeneracy and defection, because he seems in his life and writings very nearly to exemplify the *theory* of the Church of England; to have felt and developed its Catholic principles and Catholic spirit; and to have exhibited in his own person, as well as in his writings, in a most remarkable and signal manner, the unfeigned love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, faith, meekness, and temperance, which are the proper fruits of that good Spirit by which we believe it to be guided. And when we spoke of the characteristics of a Christian bishop above, and of these constituent parts of the Christian temper here, we mean, that the words may be most literally interpreted, and most closely applied. And if this be the case, no one, as was said before, can be raised who can be a more effectual witness against weak or loose principles in the views of the clergy, or careless practice in both clergy and laity, than Bishop Ken. Yet he is really, on the whole, but little known. His works are few, and have been hitherto scattered, and most of them rare. As a poet, those few to whom his writings are known have too often spoke of their tameness without seeing the bearing which many parts of them had on his own character and circumstances; and as his works have been scattered and rare, so has his character been in like manner disjointed and unknown. The Edinburgh reviewer, indeed, in his discourses on Mr. Bowles's *so-called* " Life of Ken," spoke slightingly of the subject, and questioned its importance altogether: and, in truth, we need not wonder that, if he were left to his own unaided wit and patience, to pick the mangled fragments of the good bishop from the miscellaneous reveries of his modern biographer, and then to his own unaided skill to combine them, we need not and cannot wonder if both his patience and his skill failed him, and that he obtained no definite portraiture, nay, scarcely so much as a whole feature of Ken; he could, therefore, for this, among other reasons, be in no sort a judge of the importance attaching to him, or of the very striking wholeness and almost angelic beauty of his character.

It is true it would be a work of no trifling difficulty to comprehend and delineate it; it is a task from which his relative and executor himself shrunk. "He was not so bold," he says, "as to sum up the character of such a man; he had neither leisure nor opportunity to search for particular facts, and a large account of his life would require a more able and polite genius and pen." How far it has met with these, we have too much respect for Mr. Bowles's age and name to inquire; yet we have never taken up the book without mingled sorrow and vexation, both on account of the dead and of the living, and wonder what could have tempted Mr. Bowles, "in spite of nature and his stars," to write on a subject which we are astonished to find he could at once so devotedly admire and so little understand. The compiler of the article Ken, in the Biographia Britannica, has bestowed much pains on various points which were passed over by Hawkins, and which Mr. Bowles has not touched. But the whole matter is as yet undigested, and it would seem to have remained for one who has taken so great an interest in collecting Ken's works, to collect the scattered facts which could be found concerning him, and to concentrate the light which he must have seen to have been poured in from these various sources, upon one of the most real and perfect characters with whom we are acquainted; one certainly which it will be both interesting and profitable to set before us in this particular age in which our lot is cast;—which is singularly calculated to explain to us the depth of the system under which we live, and, instead of allowing us to innovate,—to throw us back upon that system,—to call upon us to inquire how that sacred system may best be acted up to. Ken would make the clergy, from the highest order to the lowest, in the best sense, and to the best purpose dissatisfied with themselves; and less and less disposed to acquiesce in the existing *practice* of the Church of England, at the same time that he will as surely convince and satisfy them that her *theory* in government and discipline and doctrine is in the main good, and may be, what our enemies deny it ever has been or ever can be, realised.

Next, we should have been glad to have seen a fuller preface, because there is a further question more especially connected with the name of Bishop Ken, which, though it is, as we shall see, connected with his character, is nevertheless in itself quite independent of it, and involves great principles hitherto either very warmly and unprofitably, or very inadequately canvassed. We have seen that " his opinion was not agreeable with such of the non-jurors as were for continuing a separation by private consecrations among themselves." His executor states, in the " Short Account," that Ken's opinion on this head " might (should there be any good occasion) best be known by his answers to letters written from men of learning, who conversed with him on that subject;" and which he left behind him. Now the judgment of Bishop Ken in this case is so often quoted in defence of all sorts of acquiescence in existing difficulties and abuses, and his character so uniformly held up as a peace-maker, that we cannot but regard this very time, in which some of his most interesting letters on the subject have been brought forward, a very " good occasion" to examine the explanation afforded by them of the motives and principles on which he acted on various occasions, more or less connected with this continuance of the Non-juring succession. The meekness and great sweetness of his temper are frequently spoken of; and they are most rightly recommended to the notice and imitation of those who, in times of excitement, like those in which we live, are ready to come forward and speak out, when need requires it, on the various great questions which from time to time are started, and which will always receive more or less light from the disputes which agitated and distracted the Church in his time. These matters must necessarily be of intense interest to us, when we see it urged strongly, on the one hand, that his conduct is " *a good lesson to us, when division for nothing seems one of our dangers and one of our sins;*" and find some regretting on the other hand that the " non-juring *communion has not been perpetuated amongst us.*" They point out the " *position of Bishop Ken as truly magnificent had he boldly excommunicated, or deprived all who acknowledged the state bishops, and carried on the succession.*" In other words, we find the situation in which we stand at this moment running up into the difficulties and intricacies which perplexed the two classes of non-jurors, and discover ourselves to be reaping the fruit of those evils which Ken foresaw must arise from the opinions and practices then admitted, and which, perhaps, his maintenance of his claims, for aught we can tell, *might have* failed as truly as his resignation of his claims *has* failed to remedy.

We know the dilemma which may be raised on this doubtful matter. *If* Ken was *right*, it is said, then all was set at rest; the grievances of the Church of England need not be too nicely investigated; the system has, on the whole, worked well ever since, and we had better, therefore, peacefully and quietly submit to various inconveniences, and preserve a good understanding with the civil power, and uphold " the Church as by law established." *If*, on the other hand, Ken was *wrong*, and yet, notwithstanding, the Catholic communion of the Non-jurors has ceased, then it will be urged that, since the time of the extinction of that communion, we can be scarcely said to have had a Church in England. Such are the arguments and inferences which those more particularly who, in these days, would defend the Church as an establishment, and overlook its spiritual safeguards, are anxious to ground upon the non-juring question. Yet, to take the first case, we believe nothing can possibly be more unfair or untenable, than to interpret Ken's resignation under perplexities which he felt and owned, into a sanction of the principles on which the then established Church had acted, or into a contented admission of such intrusions as must at all times endanger the sacred " depositum," which it was the main object of his life to keep inviolate, and to hand on unimpaired. Ken abhorred the Latitudinarianism which the moral and political views, established or countenanced by the Revolution, had introduced into the moral system; and he saw, with evil forebodings, the practical mischiefs of those encroachments which Erastianism had made upon the sacred functions of the Church. These points were so entirely uppermost in his thoughts, that they have called forth Mr. Bowles's mingled pity and almost contempt,—who speaks of them as bugbears and spectres which haunted Ken in his solitude. But we have lived to see the truth of Ken's forebodings,—we have been reserved for an age in which we can see their reality, and may fully convince ourselves why he had reason to fear them. At all events, we are bound in fairness to look at the positive, quite as carefully as at the negative, side of his character; and to see, as best we may, by the light of those facts and documents which we may be able to obtain, *what he actually did* to maintain the ground which he considered sacred, rather than to dwell on what he *did not*, because we believe that the measures which he certainly approved would be started at, and almost disclaimed, by those who profess to be most determined by his authority. Above all, we are bound to clear away all those worldly arguments which are too apt to enter into our calculations, in these days, on such subjects, and which never once can be supposed to have crossed Ken's mind, when he did what he thought his best towards *healing*, be it remembered, a *divided* Church, not towards *joining* an *established* one.

Again, neither is it true to suppose that, *if* Ken was *wrong* in resigning, and at the same time the succession of the Non Jurors has ceased, the other part of the dilemma will follow, which is sometimes tauntingly put as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the question, viz. that there has been no Church in England since the extinction of the so-called Catholic Communion of the Non Jurors. This question was, in fact, very early anticipated in the "Christian Communion" of Kettlewell; and, so far, a foundation was laid for the principles on which Ken acted, in the chapter in which Kettlewell argues that the "ordinations of anti-bishops, though always schismatical, are not always nullities;" thus reserving, upon primitive precedent, to the Established communion the validity of its ministrations, but casting upon it an imputation, which we are more concerned to confess than to deny, of the sin of schism. This sin, on all intelligible catholic principles, attached to the established communion under the new primate Tillotson, and may, in its invisible workings, be visited at this moment on this generation; a sin of our forefathers, which their posterity are deeply concerned not to palliate but to confess and repent of.

These observations cannot but serve to convince us of the great interest which would attach to a life of Bishop Ken. We know and admire his dislike of controversy; we fully enter into his entire aversion to all casuistry; and we have no doubt but that it was a serious, and simple, and practical turn of mind, alike unwilling and unable to enter into the endless intricacies and subtleties of the whole question which agitated his brethren, that led him to disapprove of their measures, to resign his spiritual powers, and diocesan jurisdiction. These he ceded to his friend Bishop Hooper, as Bishop of Bath and Wells, on the death of the intruder Bishop Kidder, in 1703; and when, on the death of their head, Bishop Lloyd, in 1709, some of the most distinguished of the Non Jurors applied to him, he refused to challenge their obedience as a catholic Bishop, and to head their communion. We have been at some pains to prove, in a former number, that the state of the Church of England, at the time when he finally and formally resigned all claims, was most favourable to the conduct which he pursued at that juncture; that the sees were all filled, not with intruders, but with the successors of the intruders. If he could not distinctly satisfy himself as to Catholic *principle*, he did right to act on good precedents, if such might be found; at all events, in full compliance with that good and pure Christian *feeling*, or, so to say, *instinct*, which so uniformly guided him; and, of course, to act with that truly catholic temper which would forego all personal claims or interests.

Still, the assumption which is made in the salutary caution of the reviewer of Ken's works, in the British Magazine, to us of these latter days, to beware of "*division for nothing*," is very gratuitous. It is a strange thing to assume, that the distressing schism which, at that time, rent the Church, was "*division for nothing*," in any stage of it; or that the Non Jurors were the schismatics; which this language might seem half to imply. It is but fair to the great and good men who took the other side, to affirm that they had many reasons to urge. It is true, that there were those who were clamorous; and Bishop Ken, both at the time of his cession to Hooper, and on the occasion of his final cession, was assailed by some of them in a manner little becoming the good cause. A letter of some virulence is inserted by Mr. Round, as a note to one of those letters in which Ken complains to Bishop Lloyd of the treatment he experienced from his brother Non Jurors, on his cession to Bishop Hooper. Now, whatever may be thought of the tone of the letter, which is very interesting as bearing on the correspondence between Bishop Lloyd and Bishop Ken, now first published, it at least gives us some idea of the manifold difficulties in which the whole affair was involved. The knot, however, is too hard to be severed or disentangled by a letter which may have ever so much an air of unamiableness or intemperance, so long as points, so important as those which lie on the very face of it, remain unsettled or unexplained. It is evident, that Bishop Lloyd of Norwich, and Bishop Hickes, had some grounds for what they did; and if the answers of Hickes, and a few more of the answers of Lloyd, could be discovered, we should gain a better insight than we have had hitherto into the characters of both parties. We wish, therefore, that Mr. Round had not only examined by these new documents, which are precisely of that nature where character is most naturally and incidentally discovered, that of Bishop Ken; but also, in connection with them, had touched, as succinctly as the case would admit, the arguments on each side; and that he had briefly analysed the matter, more particularly as it is illustrated by the known authority to which Ken almost implicitly defers, the "Christian Communion" of Kettlewell.

We are aware that this, again, would be a work of no small difficulty, and would require deep thought and research; but we are so far from thinking that the division, whether *before or after Ken's resignation,* was necessarily *division for nothing,* that we can see ample grounds for reasoning on both sides, in the very positions on which Kettlewell has based his work. It would be, nevertheless, a work of great interest; it would lead us into a close consideration of Ken's friendships and his feelings, his judgment of Kettlewell's character and writings, his intimacy with Lloyd, Turner, and Hickes, the active promoters, on the one hand, of the non juring succession, and with Dodwell and Nelson, on the other, the opposers of it, whose correspondence with Ken on the subject still remains to us, at least, in part.

This perhaps, it might have been well to have inserted in this edition of the prose works, as well as Ken's letter to Nelson on the publication of Kettlewell's works; which Mr. Round has also omitted. Our own impression, upon a less careful review of the subject than we could wish, is nearly this,—that, in the first place, Ken saw the necessity of entering his firm and resolute, though temperate, protest against the authority by which he was deprived, and to assert his right and jurisdiction as Bishop of Bath and Wells, notwithstanding his deprivation. This is evident from what we have seen he did immediately after the act took effect, and which we learn from one of the letters. In the next place, we think there is a very strong presumption that, upon the principles of the "Christian Communion," under the existing troubles which surrounded them, he would see also the necessity of the commission by which the deprived Metropolitan Sancroft at once asserted his metropolitical authority, and conveyed his power to Bishop Lloyd, as a means of continuing to the scattered flock, who came from all quarters to London, the blessings of Christian ministrations. He would see, nevertheless, how this would necessarily throw the Church, for a while, at least, as in a state of persecution, upon itself and its spiritual resources; that it would imply the risking the loss of all its secular advantages and convenient arrangements, its temporal privileges of establishment, nay, in this great emergency, of its very houses of worship, and even its district-jurisdictions, as non-essentials, in order to secure the essentials of catholic doctrine and catholic fellowship. The instrument by which this authority was conferred, was dated Fresingfield, February, 1691. Ken, therefore, professed himself ready fearlessly to maintain his diocesan right and jurisdiction, and to supply his own flock, over which the Holy Ghost had made him overseer, with holy ministrations; and he asserted this authority as long as Kidder lived, i. e. from 1690 to 1703. Again, under the emergency, he approved, no doubt, the formation of that communion which gave up the *particular jurisdiction*, and threw the Church of England on its *catholic basis;* which was in entire harmony with Kettlewell's views, and in which Kettlewell died. But here we think it evident he stopped. The consecrations which took place afterwards, to which we have alluded, of Bishops

Hickes and Wagstaffe, on the nomination of King James, in February 1693, he did not approve. In the year 1716, indeed, a posthumous collection of papers by Hickes, was published, in which it is plainly declared to be "untrue, that the consecrations of the bishops wanted Ken's consent; for that he had even given that consent in a letter which he had written on purpose to Bishop Turner, one of the consecrators; that he afterwards congratulated one of the bishops so consecrated, and declared himself to have been, though not present in body, yet present in spirit, at the consecration." On what authority this is stated, we know not. It is clear, from the letters now published, in particular from two, addressed to Dr. Hickes in the year 1700, as well as from those which he wrote to Dodwell and Nelson in 1709, that he "always opposed those clandestine consecrations;" that he foresaw they would perpetuate the schism which he daily deplored; that he thought these insidiously procured by Melford (the Earl of Melfort), who could intend no good to the Church; but that he was at last forced to tolerate what he could not approve." In the letters to Bishop Lloyd, he mentions, more than once, that he had "recommended the two last chapters of the Christian Communion to people's reading." The one, we suppose, "*On the excusableness of receiving ministerial offices from men in a schism, rather than living without any at all;*" the other, "*On communicating, in a like necessity, where there are Prayers sinful in the matter of them,*"—as most likely to prepare a way for the closing of the rupture. He claims his friend Turner, "now with God," as having the like thoughts, and as having given the like advice to a worthy person now near him in the country; and Bishop Lloyd himself, as not disagreeing with him.

On the whole, our impression is, that the maintainers of the succession maintained it on principles sound and tenable, according to canonical strictness; that they maintained catholic views, though often with too little regard to a charitable catholic spirit; and that Ken, in consideration of the miseries and scandals occasioned by the separation, the guilt of which, nevertheless, did not lie at the door of the Non Jurors, was induced, as matter of feeling, to resign. He believed the interests of the truth to be more at stake in the existing schism than they could be in closing it; he had entered his solemn protest, and was anxious still to guard it in every possible way; and, being unable to see his way through points of casuistry, the workings of which might be interminable, he conceived himself at liberty to dispense with canonical strictness; and, where he thought catholic principle and precedent less obvious than others thought it, he resigned, but not until he had found one in whose hands he thought the "depositnm" would be safe, nor till he had vindicated and guarded the spiritual functions of the Church.

We have gone more at length into this debate, because the whole matter has attracted a growing interest in these days; and nothing is more quoted, or quoted more irrelevantly, than the cession of Bishop Ken, and his opinion on the succession. We repeat, then, that he thought it his duty, at first, to assert even the *right of jurisdiction;* and afterwards, in case of trouble and perplexity, where it could not be maintained, the *necessity of preserving catholic communion without it:* and therefore his example cannot be urged in defence of any worldly views, of any political expediency which, at any time, may tempt us to waive the interests and privileges of the Church. We should be ready as he was, as prepared by discipline and self-denial to give up all temporal interests, and should be content, too, whenever such emergencies call for it, to have *"no ground, no, not so much as to set our foot on;"* but to live as members, not of an established but of a pilgrim society, not so much of *a national* as of *the* one *catholic* and *apostolic* Church. We must learn, as he did, "the practice of Divine Love." We must become characters like Ken before we can understand and quote him as our example. We must be as fearless, and constant, and unworldly as he was, before we appeal to his acquiescence as an authority for our ourselves.

These matters form a prominent feature in the letters now published, and require full explanation. We know not how the Church question could have been touched otherwise than in a more enlarged preface—nor how Ken's character could be adequately understood without a new "Life." The letters provide ample materials for both; they require, however, frequent illustration from sources which have been long hidden, but from which might be formed a most interesting history of one of the most painful but important periods in the annals of the Church of England.

The character, however, and the views of Ken, demand more attentive study, and the controversy in which he, or rather his name, has ever been so much concerned, a more temperate and impartial decision than it has hitherto met with.

Hawkins's short account might be made, what indeed it is, and ever must be, the basis of any full and authentic account of Ken. But it is a mere frame-work; and no one can read it, we should think, without feeling that there must be far more behind which he would wish to know, concerning the subject of that memoir. And the materials are ample;—the works of Ken are a commentary upon his life. In his sermon on Daniel, he has unconsciously drawn a vivid picture of himself, and anticipates as unconsciously, with a most extraordinary foresight, the trials which awaited him. His sermon on Passion Sunday is a most beautiful statement of his Church views; his picture of "penitent, patient, reformed Judah," is a type of the Church of England; the deep humility, quietness "and confidence" of the one, a representation of what he always believed to be the spirit of the other—her "Doctrine of the Cross." His "Practice of Divine Love" is a beautiful specimen of what he believed to be her real temper, as shown in the Catechism, and of the character which a realization of the catechetical system of instruction, under God's blessing, must naturally tend to form. His "Directions for Prayer" carry on that good foundation by making the Catechism into prayer and praise, and thus identifying it with our spiritual life here, and leaving it to be more and more developed; till "the first and great commandment, to love the Lord our God with all our souls," taught us here, grows with our growth and strengthens with our strength, and so ripens into eternity. His Morning and Evening and Midnight Hymns, are a most natural description of the spirit in which he spent his days and nights; his Hymns for Saints' Days and Festivals, a proof of the even and perfect tenor of his Christian year. His "Anodynes" are a delightful exemplification of the calm and tranquil joy which he felt in the midst of most acute pain and suffering. His "Preparations for Death" are a striking commentary on the fact related of him, that he always travelled with his shroud. His works, in every part, disclose a constant struggle to realize life and immortality, and a constant and habitual converse with the invisible world It may at first be thought by the readers of his poems, that there is a tameness, and sometimes a want of taste, inconsistent with the singular and characteristic beauty of his prose works. We can see, in the names introduced, and in the structure and diction, peculiarities which Mr. Bowles has attributed, perhaps rightly, to a study and imitation of Cowley's "Davideis," but we cannot but perceive in them all a reality which at first sight does not strike us, but which grows upon us more and more. The way in which the firm and comfortable belief of the guardian angels, who, by God's appointment, "succour and defend us," both when we wake and when we sleep, is interwoven with his very existence, is most remarkable. The Hymns crown what the "Practice of Divine Love" begins; we see a soul gradually ripening for heaven, literally growing up into everlasting life.

> "Till oft converse with heavenly habitant
> Begin to cast a beam on th' outward shape,
> The unpolluted temple of the mind;
> And turn it, by degrees, to the soul's essence,
> Till all be made immortal."

We see, in every part of Ken's hymns, a commentary upon the fact mentioned by Mr. Bowles, that his Greek Testament opens of itself to this day, at the 15th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, an earnest of that great change from life to immortality, for which he lived in habitual preparation, a foretaste of the presence of the Almighty, under whose shadow he dwelt here, and in whose light he hoped to see everlasting light. We shall thus see here ample reason for being cautious and reserved on the character of Ken. We cannot sympathize with the man who could speak of his works with flippancy, or of any part of his conduct with contempt or pity. We can see reasons, also, for being jealous of allowing people to point out any frailties in a character so pure, or for admitting any works to be his which may be inconsistent with the spirit we have been describing.

We see, then, the duty of comparing his works and the known acts of his life together, and tracing what we are sure will be found their entire harmony and identity; and also the necessity of sifting carefully the testimonies, if any, on which spurious works have been admitted to be Ken's, and examining how far certain of his alleged words or works are at variance with such a spirit.

Indeed, the general idea of Ken, which the only authentic account of his life, and our inference from his various works, compared with it, conspire to set before us, is so pure and exalted, his devotion so deep and unfeigned, his self-denial and patience so uniform and unwearied, and his love of seclusion, and unobtrusive temper so undoubted, that we should be unwilling to recognize any feature which is not in full harmony with these characteristics. And again, his writings are so natural and eloquent, and so true a picture of his mind, that we should be most reluctant to admit the genuineness of any works where this naturalness, and an eloquence so peculiar that it is not easy to mistake it, should be wanting.

On these grounds, and in the absence of all external testimony, we are disposed to agree with Mr. Round, in excluding as spurious, two works, I. "The Royal Sufferer, a Manual of Meditations and Devotions, written for the use of a royal though afflicted Family," by T. K., D.D. 1699; and II. "Expostulatoria, or the Complaints of the Church of England against 1. Undue Ordinations—2. Loose Profaneness—3. Unconscionable Simony—4. Encroaching Pluralities—5. Careless Non-residence."

These books are both lying before us as we write; "The Royal Sufferer," without the name of the printer, or the place where it was printed, but with a worn impression of Vertue's fine engraving of Ken, usually prefixed to his life and poetical works; and the "Expostulatoria," with a preface professing to give a sketch of Ken's life, with every date wrong, claiming him as the author of the work, which is owned to have been written some years before the date of this publication, 1711; but supposing, moreover, that "the spirit of devotion which shines through the whole, will convince the reader acquainted with Ken's composures, that he is the incomparable author." Besides this preface, there is prefixed Dryden's "Character of a good Parson," in which the preface tells us that Mr. Dryden has very accurately drawn his picture of Bishop Ken. This character is one of the most beautiful of Dryden's imitations of Chaucer. What right these works have to these vivid representations respectively of the painter and the poet, we know not. Certain it is that the engraving by Vertue, if it is prefixed to other editions as well as to that before us, (and we know of but one between the years 1699 and 1723,) could not have found a place there before the year 1713, when the first impression of Vertue's two engravings was placed as the frontispiece to Hawkins's "Short Account." This was two years subsequent to the death of Ken. And it is equally certain that Dryden's "Character of a good Parson," which appears to have been written in 1697, could not have been affixed to either of the previous editions of the "Expostulatoria," which, under the different names of "Ichabod" and "Lacrymæ Ecclesiarum," bear date respectively 1663 and 1691.

As far as the former of the two works is concerned, Ken, who is represented by his biographer as having suffered the unfair treatment, of having spurious works attributed to him in his lifetime, either might not have known, or might not have thought it worth while to disown a work, which bearing only the initials "T. K.," notwithstanding the work speaks of the author as one of the Seven Bishops, he had no need so far to appropriate to himself, and take upon him seriously to disclaim it.

As to the latter of the two works in question, it was not, so far as appears, attributed to Bishop Ken, during his lifetime, but was published anonymously. And when it was openly published under his name, the writer of the preface above alluded to speaks of it in rather a prevaricating way, "not as levelled at the present miscarriages of the Church, but rather *written* some years since." This he gives as "his *sentiments*." Now the writer either had it in *manuscript* or he had not. If he had, he need not have spoken of his *sentiments*, he would have been tolerably well informed of its age. If, as we suspect was the case, he had it not in manuscript, but in the form of a loose pamphlet, which had become scarce and was little known, thinking it to be "applicable," as he says, "from the melancholy truths in it, to the times," he fixed the name of Bishop Ken to the title page, who was just then dead, fresh in the memory of all, a name from whom, upon such expostulations, would derive weight, and to whose prose writings, it must be confessed, many parts bear considerable similarity.

Bishop Ken died in March, 1710. The copy of the "Expostulatoria" before us was published in 1711; and the disclaimer of the work in the "Post-boy" quoted by Mr. Round bears date April, 1711. There is precisely that view contained in it which one might fancy a young person might describe, who saw vividly the contrast between the theory and the practice of the Church. If Ken wrote it, it must have been when he was yet fellow of New College, since the "Ichabod" came out in 1663, in the twenty-sixth year of his age. It was printed, however, at Cambridge; which strengthens the arguments against it. When it was published expressly under his name, Ken was no longer alive to disclaim it. And we can only regret that Hawkins, who wrote the life and published the Poems so soon after, and who could scarcely have been ignorant of the fact, should not specifically have disclaimed works thus definitely attributed to the bishop. As it is, the authority of Ken's executor is merely negative. The "Expostulatoria" is more like his writing than the "Royal Sufferer." The former is such as we might suppose his writing to have been in his earlier years. The likeness of the latter to Ken's writing we do not think Mr. Round has accounted for sufficiently by calling the points of resemblance characteristics of the writers of those times. There is a want of that sweetness and natural resignation, that habitual thankfulness and fulness of heart, which is so remarkable in Ken's works. We should say it is like a designed imitation of Ken in many parts, but, as such imitation must be, ill-sustained. We are indebted to the publisher of this work for pointing out Ken as the original from which Dryden filled up his characteristics of a Good Parson. Scott, in the note prefixed to this piece, in his edition of Dryden, has indeed this remark. "With a freedom which he (Dryden) frequently used elsewhere, he has added the last forty lines; in which, availing himself of the revolution which in Chaucer's time placed Henry IV. on the throne, he represents the principles of his priest as the same with those of the non-juring clergy of his own day. Indeed the whole piece is greatly enlarged on Chaucer's sketch." Mr. Bowles has pointed out the passages. There could be but one of that non-juring party to whom they could apply,—that one who was to Scott, perhaps, as he has been to many others, in great measure, unknown; and whom the publisher of the Expostulatoria has identified in lines which do not describe a class, but distinguish an individual.

"A parish priest was of the pilgrim train,
An awful, reverend, and religious man.
His eyes diffused a venerable grace,
And charitiy itself was in his face.
Rich was his soul tho' his attire was poor,
(As God had cloth'd His own ambassador),
For such on earth his bless'd Redeemer bore.
Of sixty years he seem'd, and well might last
To sixty more, but that he liv'd too fast.
Refin'd himself to soul to curb the sense,
And made almost a sin of abstinence.
Yet had his aspect nothing of severe,
But such a face as promis'd him sincere.
Nothing reserv'd or sullen was to see,
But sweet regards, and pleasing sanctity.
Mild was his accent, and his action free.
With eloquence innate his tongue was arm'd,
Tho' harsh the precept, yet the preacher charm'd;
For, letting down the golden chain from high,
He drew his audience upwards to the sky;
And oft with holy hymns he charm'd their ears,
A music more melodious than the spheres.
For David left him when he went to rest
His lyre, and after him he sung the best.
He bore his great commission in his look,
But sweetly temper'd awe, and softened all he spoke."

We shall be pardoned for quoting these lines, which certainly have to us had a new aspect altogether since we have connected them with Bishop Ken. The allusion in the Revolution is equally striking.

" —— when Richard was depos'd,
And high and low with happy Harry clos'd,
This prince, tho' great in arms, the priest withstood,
Near tho' he was, yet not the next in blood."

And Ken's subsequent conduct, his retired habit, and silent thoughtfulness.

"He join'd not in their choice, because he knew
Worse might, and often did, from change ensue.
Much to himself he thought, but little spoke,
And undepriv'd his benefice forsook;
Now through the land his cure of souls he strech'd,
And like a primitive apostle preach'd,
Still cheerful, ever constant to his call,
By many follow'd, lov'd by most, admir'd by all,
With what he begg'd his brethren he reliev'd,
And gave the charities himself receiv'd."

These points are still more strongly illustrated by the letters now published; by Ken's charitable aid again and again rendered to his friend Dr. Thomas Smith, the ejected fellow of Magdalen College; and by the glowing piety which we can now see more perfectly in this valuable collection of his prose writings, in which, as Dryden truly concludes,

> "He shines by his own proper light."

There is more, no doubt, which might be said on these two works, which would in parts admit a careful comparison with parts of his genuine works. We repeat our opinion, so far as it goes, that Mr. Round has rightly omitted them from the acknowledged writings. And we would not wish to have seen them admitted otherwise than as *doubtful*, and in a *different* type. Of the spuriousness of the "Retired Christian" we suppose there is no doubt. But we probably shall surprise those who have been more or less interested in this subject by an opinion which we do not venture to express without a good deal of thought, and in which we are most willing to be set right. We cannot, on the whole, so readily agree with Mr. Round in dismissing without more investigation the "Letter to Archbishop Tenison on his Funeral Sermon on Queen Mary," which he has unhesitatingly rejected as spurious, and which Mr. Bowles concludes from Burnet's silence could not have proceeded from Ken's high and honourable mind, "though he had no reason to be grateful."

In the first place, we suppose it came out at first in Ken's name. The copy which we have seen has unfortunately lost its title page; but wherever we see it spoken of, as in Rapin's History, and in the Biographia Britannica, we find it unequivocally spoken of as his. It is strange, however, that under the article Ken, which has been compiled with great care, there is no allusion to it whatever; whilst the sermon on Ascension Day, which certainly never was printed, but only carped at by a Romanist who went to Bath Abbey to hear it, and published his reflections, is mentioned amongst his works. It is strange also that the "Retired Christian" is the only work specifically disclaimed as spurious. However the delicate nature of the subject itself, and the connection of Ken with the royal household some years before, would call for a distinct denial on the part of himself or his friends. It was open to the express disavowal of himself and his executor; perhaps it was met by that disavowal; but it would be to us a matter of great interest to inquire whether between the beginning of the year 1695, when it appeared, and the bishop's death, any information on this head is to be found.

Different people, indeed, read with different impressions; but we do not ourselves so clearly see that "the temper and tone shown through the whole of it are sufficient to prove that it was not written by Ken." Nor do we understand it as Mr. Bowles has understood it, as "reviling the memory of his respected and buried mistress."

We introduced these last few observations on the excluded works with a sketch of the general idea we have of Ken's character, and expressed our full sense of the jealousy with which we should view any work attributed to him which should derogate from it. But it is matter of interesting inquiry, as bearing on other characters besides that before us, how far that Christian meekness for which he was so distinguished, and that glowing piety, are necessarily inconsistent with that quickness of feeling and honest indignation, which Bishop Butler rightly defines in his sermon on Resentment, as "that passion from whence men take occasion to run into the dreadful vices of malice and revenge, but which even itself, as implanted in our nature by God, is not only innocent, but a generous movement of the mind; as in itself and its original no more than indignation against what is wrong." With all his softness, there is undoubtedly in Ken greater strength than some might suppose; with all his amiableness and self-discipline, there is an unflinching Christian boldness. No one can help seeing that charity is his very life, but based as it was on the love of God, it must be, *ἀγαπὴ ἀνυποκριτος*, "love without dissimulation," in any sense. We believe this to be intimately connected with that entire love of truth, that uniform simplicity and sincerity, and plain dealing, which is visible in every act of his life, in his expostulations with the great, in his correspondence, especially with Bishop Burnet, and his answers at the "Examination before the Privy Council" appended to his "Life." We are aware we are treading on delicate ground, and we are so unwilling to let any one run away with the notion that this is an infirmity in Ken, that we ask those who may be interested in the matter, taking Ken's known character into the account, and the two documents we have alluded to, to read the letter; and we cannot believe that their impression will be so unfavourable as it seems to have been. The truth we believe is this. Mary's character has been known to us by unkind and fulsome flatteries. The Revolution has been looked upon in a mere political light. But to one who looked on things, as Ken did, in their realities, whose tie had been so close and confidential, and who felt how all domestic ties were broken by the political expediences of the day; who knew that the daughter was lost in the queen, and that the sister was unforgiven, there was much to feel and to say. It is sad that royal death-beds should have been thus brought forward; but when we compare the conduct of Tenison here with Ken's plain dealing with Charles II.; when we see, moreover, throughout, so far from any reviling of his royal mistress, a most anxious and affectionate feeling on her behalf; real and heartfelt pity, not blame; we seem bound to read with a pastoral not a political eye, what Ken may have written as an early and faithful adviser of his mistress, whom he never failed to pray for, from the moment he heard of her sickness.

We may, perhaps, be able at some future opportunity to enter more fully on the works, and to touch many points which we have left untouched, but we should at least read with candour what is capable, we cannot but think, whoever be the author, of a favourable interpretation, and what was once thought less harshly of.

[illegible]

ART. VIII.—*Random Recollections of Exeter Hall in* 1834—1837. By one of the Protestant Party. London: Nisbet. 1838.

RELIGION is a social principle; it cannot exist without fellow-feeling, nor can fellow-feeling be maintained without assemblies and celebrations. It is very well to maintain its more private and personal nature in a treatise for the closet or a discussion to serve a purpose; but the notion of strictly independent, secret, isolated religion is unreal and theoretical. He who believes in a Maker and Governor believes that he is Maker and Governor of others besides himself; and (if we may so parallel the sacred text) he who regards Him who made, regards them also who are made by Him. And, moreover, in a world of sin, the current of which runs strongly against the voice of conscience, and the high but delicate instincts of truth and purity, human nature, conscious of its weakness, will ever, in mere self-defence, look out for sympathy and co-operation in its arduous duty of maintaining what is unseen against what is seen.

When then men talk of religion being a secret thing between each man and his Maker, as being too sacred for co-operation, and too peculiar and individual for sympathy, they are either letting their words outrun their ideas or they are mere sceptics and men of the world, catching at any excuse which offers and promises well, in order to get rid of a subject they do not like. Men who are well content with things visible, and wish to frame the materials which this world supplies into a perfect system, who have their *summum bonum* upon earth, and who feel that it is attainable by means which are of earth, consider the religious principle as nothing more or less than a principle of disorder, as the cause of infinite disarrangements and perplexities in that view and method of life which they would fain pursue; and the religious element in our nature as a troublesome and vexatious phenomenon, which they cannot deny to exist, and to require satisfying, though they console themselves by a plain denial of its being a primary or essential part of our nature, or more than the result of education and association, and accordingly do their best to bribe it into quietness as cheaply and as expeditiously as they can.

Such is the case with those who deny that religion is a social principle, because they wish it expelled from society; but others, and the mass of persons, who deny it, deny it in theory only, for party reasons, from bad education, or from other unsatisfactory causes; and they convict themselves of inconsistency, and show that they are using words for ideas, by forthwith proceeding to act against their own doctrine. They resolutely maintain that each individual man must be ultimately dependent for his religious opinions on himself; and yet in spite of this, by societies, and meetings, and tracts, and united movements, and celebrations, they do bring to bear upon him an extrinsic and external influence, an authority distinct from the sacred volume and from his personal and private inquiry into it, and calculated to overawe and to over-persuade him. They set up a power, the same in kind as the visible Church, to impress and seduce his imagination, in advance or in prejudice of his reason. In theory they maintain the right of private judgment, and the supremacy of Scripture without note or comment; yet by all the enthusiasm of social feeling and all the excitement of a struggle, by those means which the Church uses openly and avowedly, they strive, without avowing them, to oppose them when avowed, to oppose them in the Church.

Even a system (of external *worship* we cannot call it, but) of ceremony and circumstance, is in course of formation, as the shell of testaceous animals, being at once the development and protection of that New Religion, which it has been the fashion among us of late years to substitute for the Ancient Faith. By the ancient religion we mean that which Popery corrupted; by the new religion we mean that which Luther founded in his new definition of faith, and his new dogma, that justification by faith only is the one fundamental truth of the Gospel. The old religion had its pageants, rites, and festivals; and the spirit of destruction which has been unchained in these last centuries declared that such observances were heathenish and idolatrous. The old religion had, or rather it has, its discipline, its monuments, and its ritual, as (by a good Providence) they are still preserved to us; and these were, or rather still are, represented by its enemies as unlawful persuasives, yokes, beggarly elements, instruments of bondage, or rags for the vanity fair of the great Babel. It had its solemn services; and what were these forsooth but mummeries, the fruit of idle legends, of pious frauds, representations *ad captandum,* evil doings that good might come, or exaggerations of what was true, or occasions of unduly exalting individuals, some poor, frail, and fallible being, who after all was but a man of like passions with the rest? It had its religious societies; and what were these but unscriptural, because not prescribed in Scripture? It had its convocations of clergy; and how could a hundred heads be infallible when laid together, when each separately was not so? It had its processions and litanies, and what were these but accurate and deliberate copies of Pagan customs? The most virtuous feelings were displayed, and the most touching delicacy, and the most jealous indignation at religion, which is a thing of the heart, being made so outward, so unspiritual, so unchristian.

It is said that nature will always revenge herself when outraged, and what is true of nature in the general holds good also as regards her religious workings. This pseudo-evangelicism, which is so alarmed at undue influences and yokes of bondage, is now acting over again, only with new dresses, what in many times and places it has already performed since Calvin set up his platform at Geneva. After destroying forms it is introducing others, which bear the same relation to the true ones as the tyranny of a usurper to the legitimate authority of the dethroned monarch. Well, indeed, were it for this king of the barricades if it could assume the venerable character of a father and judge; but, as was to be expected, being set up in rebellion, it has no where been able to preserve reverence, and for no long while to maintain even order. And at the present day, and among ourselves, it presents perhaps the most singular aspect which it has yet shown, and to which the small volume we have prefixed to these remarks will enable us to direct attention. While it still retained in its bosom some of its mother's warmth and its mother's fear, there was a sort of solemnity and seriousness in its movements. The Puritans were not triflers, nor the Covenanters cowards; but now, in a time of prosperity, when there is little to season our faith, and of scepticism, when there is much to sap it, while it professes more than ever the pomp of externals, and the impressiveness of combination, yet (most remarkable it is) it has stripped these instruments of influence, almost altogether of their sacred character, aims at religious objects by means which do not even pretend to religion, offers to God "the sacrifice of fools," and pleads for Him in the garb of the world.

The old religion thinks it scorn to appear before men except as God's minister. Its outward forms are but the type of what it is within. Within it is calm and serene, as the sea spread before the throne of God, reflecting in its bosom the stars of heaven and giving to view "the jewels of the great deep" which lie beneath. And such as this is the garb which, at its Master's command, it has put on from the beginning. Though its coat was of many colours, yet it was woven from the top throughout; though made with much cunning work and many a curious device, yet it was "fine linen, clean and white," like the inward "righteousness of saints." Such was the sanctity, the comeliness, the gravity of those ancient forms, which as being imbued with what they represented resembled it, and while they resembled it promised it. The order of the ministry, the descent and relationship of the churches, the ritual of worship, the precepts for governing, evangelizing, protesting, suffering, all spoke of that inward heaven which exists in its degree in the soul of every true Christian, and has its perfect unapproachable prototype in that of his Divine Master. What Christians were in private in the beauty of holiness, such were they when they met together in one, each member knowing his own place, as each faculty of his soul its own function. In the religious man, reason, will, conscience, affections, and passions do not struggle together, or settle in some compromise or "social compact" one with another; but each recognizes and takes what is its own by nature. And, in like manner, if we would see what true social religion is, we must betake ourselves to the various forms in which it is presented to us in antiquity, and not the least to that form which was the most formal and august of all, and the type of all in their several degrees, its synodal meetings. We shall betake ourselves, for instance, to Eusebius, and there read the account of the great Nicene Council: how the Emperor of the World provided for the Bishops a great hall in his palace, in the capital of Bithynia, where above 300, from all parts of the world, assembled at his charge; how they seated themselves each in his place in silence, waiting his arrival, and how, when he entered robed in his imperial purple, he gravely stood in the middle of the fathers till they called on him to take his seat. Or we may consult the following formulary for the opening of a Spanish council, which Mr. Keble has lately printed from Hardouin.

"At the first hour of the day, before sunrise," says this document, "let all be cast out of the Church, and the entrances being barred, let all the door-keepers stand at the one door, through which the prelates are to enter. And let all the bishops assembling go in together, and take their seats according to the time of their consecration. When all the bishops have come in and taken their places, next let those presbyters be summoned whose admission the nature of the case in hand seems to warrant; and let no deacon intrude himself among them. After these may be admitted the more eminent among the deacons, whose presence is required by the regular form of proceeding. And a circle being made of the bishops' seats, let the presbyters sit down behind them; those, namely, whom the metropolitan has selected to be his assessors, such of course as may act with him both in judging and pronouncing sentence. Let the deacons stand in sight of the bishops; then let the laity also enter, who, by choice of the council, have obtained the privilege of being there. Moreover, the notaries must also come in, as is directed by the regular form, for reading documents and taking notes. Then, the doors being fastened, and the prelates sitting in long silence, and lifting up their whole heart to the Lord, the archdeacon shall say,—'Pray ye!' and presently they shall all fall on their faces to the earth, as well the bishops as the presbyters: and they, *continuing long in silent prayer, with weepings and moanings*, one of the *elder* bishops shall arise, and pronounce a supplication aloud unto the Lord, they all lying still on the ground . . . . The supplication being ended, and all having answered 'Amen,' the archdeacon says, 'Stand ye up.' Immediately let all arise, and *with all fear of God and orderly discipline*, let bishops and presbyters both take their seats. And thus, all in their places, sitting silently, a deacon, *wearing the albe*, bringing forward in the midst the Book of the Canons, reads aloud the chapter on the manner of holding councils . . . . And the extract from the Canons being ended, the metropolitan bishop shall address the council with an exhortation."—*Keble. Postscript to Serm. on Trad.* p. 86.

Or if we would see how matters were conducted in the very rudiments of the Church, we may read in the book of Acts how " the *apostles* and *elders*," the bishops and priests, " came together to consider of " a matter in dispute, and " the *multitude*" or laity " *kept silence*," " *giving audience*" to their superiors in the Church; till after discussion ended, the presiding apostle summed up and gave judgment, and then all together, bishops, clergy, and laity drew up a declaration founded upon it. These are different forms of one and the same orderly discipline, types of one and the same inward harmony; of what St. Paul calls the Church's " order and steadfastness of faith." On the other hand, if we would know what kind of proceeding was *not* Christian, we shall find it in Tertullian's well known description of the heretical assemblies, which will stand as a specimen of many besides it, which the early writers contain. " They are destitute," he says, " of gravity, of reverence, of rule, *so as to correspond with their creed*. First, who is catechumen, who believes, does not appear; one and all are admitted, one and all hear, one and all pray; nay, though the heathen were to come in, they would cast their holy things to dogs, and their pearls, their false pearls, to swine. This break up of discipline they call simplicity; our care of it they call corruption. Moreover, they are friends with all persons promiscuously; no matter what their private differences, so that they can combine together against the One Faith. They all are pompous, all consider themselves enlightened. Their catechumens are perfect first, and taught afterwards."—*De Præsc. fin.*

Such is the difference between the outward forms of truth and falsehood in the high and public functions of teaching and propagating the faith; and what it is on the largest scale, such is it in all, however reduced, wherever there is combination for religious ends. If, on the other hand, we would know what it is in private and individual duties, we shall detect truth by the same marks of simplicity, sobriety, staidness, and sanctity. What the ceremonial of a synod is to a body of Christians, such is the ceremonial of prayer, fasting, and almsgiving, as the most Sacred Authority enjoins them, to the private Christian; such is the vision of charity and humility as developed and typified in the Apostle's instances of "attending on strangers," "washing the saints' feet," and "relieving the afflicted;"—duties all of them of a severe and grave character, bearing upon them the impress of the inward principle from which they spring. And of a like solemn nature have hitherto been the outward forms of every popular religion, true and false; they have been *religious* forms. Far different is the religion which has become popular in this day. It is its peculiarity, that, though professing to be very high and warm and influential, it acts by instruments which do not even affect seriousness or reverence. For washing the saints' feet it has substituted charity bazaars, and for synods it has its May meetings; so that it is scarcely too much to say, that as former ages of the Church have been called, one the gnostic age, another the scholastic, another the synodal, this, in like manner, has earned the title of the sæculum joculare.

One phenomenon, indeed, is found amid the Ultra-Protestantism of this day, which certainly has a deep and earnest character; but has not yet made way in the body of the English community—and may it never!—We allude to the observance, habit, occurrence, or by whatever more suitable name it is to be called, of Revivals, as they exist on the other side the Atlantic. Something, indeed, of the kind seems to flourish among the Wesleyans in some parts of this country; but their proper field has hitherto been North America,—in those vast regions where the Church is not, or sits in feebleness as a stranger or outcast, where a Christian people are like sheep without a shepherd, and where Christian life is a fever, an ague, or a spasm, barely sustaining itself by such intermittent and convulsive throes, which, in a state of healthy action, are but a disarrangement, not an exercise of its functions. Long, indeed, may such dreary and miserable exhibitions be confined to the "dry places" in which they originated, the solitudes of heresy and sectarianism; and speedy, so be it! may the deliverance of the poor captives be from the iron yoke which their forefathers have forged for them, instead of the "light burden" of the Church Catholic. But still, after all, such manifestations are of a religious nature; they correspond to the object from which they profess to arise; they speak about serious things in a serious tone; they carry upon them marks of enthusiasm, moral power, nay, and sometimes issue in permanent fruits. They cannot raise a smile; they excite respect, fear, sorrow, compassion. Far removed, as they are, from the sweet and equable calmness of the Church, yet they are an approximation to her temper, so far as this, that they indicate earnestness. Such then is the most favourable specimen at this day, under which, what may be called the ceremonial of the New Religion presents itself, as seen in America; but here, while it cannot dispense with forms and festivals, any more than across the water, one need not look very far to be convinced that its principle, as it exists, is not deep enough to be dark, nor vehement enough to be troubled, nor real enough to be violent. It has not life enough in it to give birth to deeds of the same nature as its professions. While in America it has developed itself in the hideous reality of revivals, it supports an artificial existence here on such expedients as have been mentioned, upon the mirthful, brilliant, and varied paraphernalia of charity bazaars and May meetings.

Now here we must make ourselves clearly understood, lest we convey an impression which we do not mean. When we condemn these instruments of religious undertakings, we have no intention whatever of implying any thing disrespectful towards this or that individual who engages in them, whether as provider or purchaser, speaker or listener. If, indeed, such things are evil, as we verily believe them to be, evil of course there must exist some where or other, in those who take part in them, whithersoever we shift or however we divide the blame; but there are very many at all times, perhaps the majority, who take those forms of religious operations which they find at hand, as the means of their own exertions, and have no time, no opportunity, no taste for inquiring whether these are the best possible, or intrinsically defensible. The most venerated names have before now appeared on the platform of religious societies; the kindest hearts have worked for bazaars; the most innocent curiosity, and the most guileless zeal have listened to the speeches which Scotch or Irish talent circulates through the country. We feel all this most fully; and should be sorry to seem to feel otherwise; and yet we maintain that, although there be some who, as they did not cause, so are not hurt by the evil they take part in, still in the majority this hearing, speaking, buying, and vending, either originates or results, more or less, in that lower and less religious state of mind which is the soul of the system itself.

Dropping then individuals, and looking simply at the system, which they support, we see in this day this remarkable fact, that the New Religion, while it has recourse to externals, shrinks from religious externals. Much might be said in illustration from the case of charity bazaars, did our present subject lead us to consider it. Certainly it infuses sad suspicion that such methods of raising money are an evidence of the decay of genuine piety. What have the elegant nothings displayed on such an occasion to do with contributions for the serious matters of Church building or supporting hospitals? What do they intimate, when rightly interpreted, but this,—that bare charity or piety is too austere and imperative for men of this generation; and that Christians will not submit now to be beguiled of their alms or offerings, except by sweetening an unpalatable duty? Were they, indeed, but *additional* to large sacrifices freely made on the altar of Christian love, they might be taken as specimens how to convert *all* we do and are, even the elegancies of life, to the service of religion; but, being what they are, and working as they do, assuredly they are not a raising of the world to the Church, but a degradation of the Church to the world. And, moreover, were the subject before us, much might be said of the potent influence exerted on such occasions by the young ladies who ofttimes take their station at the booths and vend their charity. Aged bishops are said, of old time, to have exerted an arm of force, and to have compelled others to enjoy the privileges, and undertake the duties of the Christian Church;—but now-a-days, bright eyes and tasteful bonnets are found more effective, and, though we do not pretend to be connoisseurs in the matter ourselves, we certainly have read in the public prints that, whatever their advantage in the ball-room, our charming countrywomen never look so well as in a morning dress.

And, while the bazaar is the realm of feminine beauty, the platform is the region of manly eloquence, and still with the same object of propagating religion by means not religious. The societies which are there advocated are engaged always in benevolent, often in the most sacred and serious religious objects; this should be attentively considered. The Bible Society is formed for giving to individuals the sacred volume, which moreover it considers to be the one means of spiritual life. The Church Missionary Society is for the conversion of the heathen; the Jews, as its name denotes, for that of the once chosen people; the Reformation Society for withstanding errors which their agents in their printed papers declare to be worse than paganism. Objects higher and more momentous cannot be conceived; and individual speakers confess that they are such, and treat them accordingly; and yet, on the whole, strange to say, the anniversary and other meetings, which are the most formal image of these societies, are essentially not religious. They *cannot* be made religious, for the attempt to make them so would be the signal for private judgment to insist through a thousand separate voices upon a thousand separate varieties of creed or form; and they *will* not be made religious, because their supporters hold that what inspires respect is a degradation of religion, a superstition and a mummery, and that forms are only safe when variable and secular. The temple of this new system is Exeter Hall; its holytide is "the London season;" its chancel is a platform; its cathedral throne is the chairman's seat; its ministers are the speakers; for holy salutations it uses "Ladies and Gentlemen;" for benedictions it has "cheers;" for a creed it maintains the utility of combination; and for holy services and godly discipline it proclaims civil and religious liberty throughout the world.

If we seem to have said more than the case warrants, we beg objectors to suspend their judgment till they have read the little book which has given occasion to our remarks, or at least such extracts as we are proceeding to lay before them. It consists of a series of lively and graphic descriptions of the leading speakers in Exeter Hall, for the sake of those who, not being resident in London, "have no opportunity," as it says, "of becoming acquainted with their manner, style, and appearance;" in the number of which occur names, which are little worthy of the notoriety it has given to them, and towards which men of the most opposite views must feel a reverence not to be destroyed even by Exeter Hall. At the same time we are bound to say that, except in one or two instances, there is nothing ill-natured in the author's pleasantry; he seems to have had no intention of doing more than drawing an entertaining sketch of what takes place in the great meetings of the religious world, and to have been most benevolently inclined to the actors in them whom he describes. If he is satirical, he cannot help it; it is the fault of his subject. Indeed, the tone of his volume, if we are right in estimating it, is a curious illustration of the point which we bring its contents to prove. He seems, that is, to have set about his task with a high notion of what he undertook to relate; but having not a grain of reverence for a system which is not calculated to impart any, and writing as people write, when they think they may make themselves at home with their subject, he has, without intending or fully knowing it, drifted off from seriousness to satire, and from praise to blame, leaving the reader quite at a loss how to draw the line between these opposites, or how far he means the one, how far the other. Ridicule certainly is not the test of truth; the most serious things may be made ridiculous. Exeter Hall and its religion would not be a joke merely because a lively pen had made them so. But when a professed admirer cannot help unawares passing from panegyric to mockery, then the suspicion does fairly cross one, whether such a result is not the legitimate termination of the system, and the person instancing it is not merely following out the *reductio ad absurdum* which fairly attaches to it.

The author's own state of mind is most singularly illustrated by his Title-page, Dedication and Introduction. He calls his book " *Random Recollections* of Exeter Hall, by one of the *Protestant Party*." Is this joke or earnest? Again, his Dedication is to " Mrs. ——, one of the *best of women* and tenderest of mothers, these pages are inscribed as a token of filial love." This of course is most serious earnest; yet surely not of the most respectful kind. And again, he says he has " thrown together some recollections of several among the principal characters *who appear before the audiences* of Exeter and Freemasons' Hall, or the Hanover-square Rooms;" or in other words, we suppose, who " appear" on the London (religious) boards " before" overflowing houses. And he has been led to do so by a publication called " Random Recollections of the House of Lords." The House of Lords is a most august assembly; but we never heard it claimed as a religious one; nor do we see that, if its members may be treated in a " random" way, that therefore the same treatment may be applied to those who take part in high religious matters, such as the propagation of Christianity and controversy with the Romanists.

With this introduction of the author let us first avail ourselves of his description of the large room of Exeter Hall itself.

> " The large room of Exeter Hall was built to contain 4000 persons, with a splendid range of raised seats, to the left of the main entrance, a spacious area in front of it, and a platform, which of itself will accommodate 500 persons, to the right. At the back of the platform were formerly two sunk galleries, like the side-boxes of a theatre, which were opened or closed at pleasure, by means of moveable planks, which may be put aside during the progress of a meeting. They are now thrown completely open. The platform itself is elevated about six feet above the floor of the area, or central seats, and is finished in front by a handsome iron rail; the large and ornamental bars of which, placed about one foot from each other, are connected at top by a thick mahogany

spar. In the centre of its front row stands the chair, which in form much resembles that of King Edward the Confessor, in Westminster Abbey. It is of handsomely carved mahogany, with massy open elbows, and is cushioned, in the seat and back, with purple leather. Its dimensions are very large, and any gentleman of small, or even of moderate size, who may preside, can never be said to *fill* it. Very few chairmen appear to advantage there; some seem lost in it, others, at a loss how to occupy it, and where to sit in it, whether backwards or forwards, upright or lounging, to the right or to the left. Those who have seen it tenanted by Lord Winchelsea, will agree that few sit there with greater dignity, or appear more advantageously to themselves.

"To the right and left are common mahogany chairs for the speakers, and behind these are rows of high-backed benches, rising gradually above each other, and intersected by two flights of steps, which extend from the front row up to the entrances at the back. At upper corners are covered staircases, communicating with these entrances, the tops of which formerly joined the sunk galleries, and were often occupied by rows of ladies, more adventurous or less punctual than the rest. The platform is nominally appropriated to gentlemen, but the more curious sex seldom fail to get admittance there, in limited (or sometimes in large) numbers."—pp. 7—9.

"When the room is quite filled, the finest view of it is from the deep recesses behind the platform. The scene visible from thence is truly magnificent. Below you lies the platform, slanting downwards, and, extending into a crescent shape, with its crowds, sitting or standing; beyond them is the large flat surface of the area, its close benches all filled, and the avenues among them occupied by chairs, or by persons who are fain to stand, for want of sitting-room. Behind this are the raised seats, gradually appearing one behind another, and equal to half the size of the whole room; all again fully crowded, and the descending steps among the benches filled by the standing multitude. Over their heads, the whole scene is crowned by the back gallery, at a height of many feet, behind the crimson draperies which extend among the pillars, and this is completely full also. Those who wish to realize the saying of "a sea of heads," should take this view of Exeter Hall, on some popular occasion. When such an assembly rises, for prayer or praise, at the beginning or end of a meeting, the sight is still more stupendous; and the degree of sound they are able to produce, in the way of cheering or singing, is almost incredible. There have been occasions when that vast room has rung with the voices of those assembled within its walls; and a second peal of cheers succeeding, before the echoes of the first have died away, the noise altogether has been of a nature that few persons could bear unmoved."—pp. 10, 11.

Under this, it seems, there is a second room for meetings, and the inconvenience resulting is thus described:—

"The plaudits of the upper and larger audience frequently drown the voices of those who are addressing the smaller one below; as they are situated immediately under the right side of the large Hall. Should the applause over-head not be very loud, it seems to arise from the lower room, and many an inexperienced speaker has paused for his hearers to cease their cheers, when in reality the noise came from above, and had no reference to him whatever, but was addressed to some orator up stairs, perhaps expressing opinions diametrically opposed to his own."—p. 13.

A sketch of the Hanover-square Rooms, which follows, adds the effect of light and shade to the above descriptions.

"There is much of the private drawing-room style about it, which might keep a less polished auditory in good order; but the sex and station of those who fill the chief part of the place are so unfavourable to loud acclamations, or any noise whatever, that stranger-speakers are sometimes quite daunted at the silence in which they are heard; and mistaking the well-bred attention bestowed upon their addresses for indifference, they seem to long for the tumultuous approbation of Exeter Hall. A few friendly cheers on his rising and his concluding, a gently swelling murmur of applause, or a subdued laugh during his speech, are all that an orator at the Hanover Rooms must expect to call forth. I think I have never heard a hearty, noisy round of cheers bestowed there upon even the most popular favourites of the day, those who would elsewhere have been received with a deafening uproar of delight."—p. 14.

But, to return to Exeter Hall.

"The conformation of the Hall is not favourable to the larger class of human voices, and there are but few speakers who make themselves well heard throughout the room: the generality speak too low, or have too little power of lungs to be heard far beyond the centre of the area; while others, who almost deafen the sitters near them, are equally unintelligible to those at a distance, from the echo of the place itself. Thus the gentle speeches of Lords Cholmondely and Chichester, and the thundering oratory of Dr. Duff are nearly all alike pantomime to the occupants of the raised seats; though from diametrically opposite causes, for the Doctor speaks just as much too loud as their Lordships' voices are too low. Perhaps Lords Winchelsea and Roden, Captain W. Wellesley and Mr. J. E. Gordon, are four of the most universally audible speakers we have. Their voices, though widely differing from each other, are all loud, clear, and equal-toned, and may be well heard from an upper raised seat, or even from the gallery; while, in order to hear agreeably an address from Mr. John Hockin, I should prefer to be in one of the outer passages, or perhaps even in the Strand itself."—pp. 16—17.

The various feelings under which the audience are brought together are next described; and we insert the passage to show how much in earnest the author is on the whole, a fact which needs impressing again and again on the reader's mind, while he turns over the pages which follow.

"Perhaps the truth may be more accurately stated by saying, that although many among the hearers, especially the younger part of them, may be drawn together by the love of a holiday, a crowd, and some fine speaking, with a peep at public proceedings, yet numbers who attend the anniversaries of our societies are attracted thither chiefly, if not solely, by a desire of information as to the progress of religious and moral truth, and the wish to improve their own zeal by kindling their torches from those of the most devoted servants or Missionaries of the Cross.

"Of these latter exemplary persons, it will not be too much to say, that though some of them, unknown to their hearers, and it may be, unknown to themselves, may cherish within them feelings of self-complacency, or a desire to shine in the public eye; yet the major part, whether noblemen, clergymen, or others, are simple-hearted, straightforward benevolent men, whose chief desire, in addressing public assemblies, as well as in the other actions of their lives, is to spread civilization and Christianity among their fellow-creatures, and to promote the worship and the glory of their God."—pp. 19, 20.

The volume is divided into six chapters, in which are successively discussed "Noble Speakers," "Clerical Speakers," "Parliamentary Speakers," "Naval and Military Speakers," and "Various Lay Speakers;" among which are to be found, the Duke of Newcastle, Lords Cholmondely, Roden, Brougham and Ashley, Rev. Baptist Noel, Drs. Cooke and Croly, Rev. Messrs Wolff and Cunningham, Mc Ghee and O'Sullivan, Benson and Beamish, Mc Neile and Bickersteth. A short account is given of their person, manner, dress, attitude, voice, and style of speaking, and of any special occasion which has distinguished them for the better or the worse. The delineation is not only playful and good natured, but displays a good deal of nice discrimination, and is very little overcharged. Incidentally too it brings out the peculiarities of the place to which it relates; and is a most conclusive witness to two points concerning these meetings, which were antecedently to be expected; first, that their end and object as meetings, is not an act of thanks or praise where it is due, not a contemplation of religious subjects, not even the spread of information on religious subjects, but an exhibition of persons and oratory; and *through* this the advancement of such ulterior ends as have better claim to a religious parentage. Publicity and money are gained for the objects to which the respective societies are devoted on the consideration of a certain quantum of entertainment given or received,—on the terms of seeing a number of noble and other personages, and hearing a number of celebrated or eloquent speakers. And next, as was to be expected, it clearly appears that variety and novelty are principal conditions of these exhibitions, whether they be secured by the judicious admixture of Scotch and Irish eloquence, or of men of rank and men of name, or of old favourites and of strangers, and of native Englishmen and South Sea Islanders or Kamschatkans.

The author, as we have seen, is anxious to supply for those who do not live in London some portion of that treat, which none but Londoners can fully obtain; and therefore serves up before his readers a number of distinguished persons from various professions and ranks of life. Men are hard to please; we suspect some will be angry that they are left out in the bill of fare; but we are quite sure there are others who will be disgusted at being inserted. However, it is the fashion of the day to sacrifice private property to what may be called the railroad system; and we at least who profess no acquaintance with Exeter Hall are gainers by our author's adoption of it. But for this volume we should not know that Lord Downshire's "eyes are blue with an expression of gravity, his nose long and somewhat sharp, but the greatest peculiarity of his countenance is a nervous twitch in its muscles when he speaks. It gives you the idea *that the right side of his face is jesting with one half of his audience, at the expense of the other,* upon the sentence he has just uttered."—p. 30. Nor would they know that Lord Roden's "gesture is energetic, sometimes vehement, and without much variety," consisting "chiefly of *a powerful wielding of the arm.*"—p. 32; nor of Lord Winchelsea, that "the first remark you would make on seeing him is, '*How clean he looks,*' and the second, 'How honest!'"—p. 37; nor that his action consists in "a short start back, an indignant stamp with the foot, and a repelling motion of the right arm, with a *most indescribable energetic shake of the whole person.*"—p. 39; nor that while he declares the "zeal for the good cause which burns within his breast," "he bestows, at the same moment, *a far-fetched stroke, like that of a sledge hammer,* which would nearly destroy a less firmly built frame than that which receives it."—p. 40; nor that Lord Chichester's "hair is dark brown, long and bushy, as well as his whiskers, and as he often dresses in a suit of the same shade," he sometimes looks "as nearly as possible *all of one colour* from head to foot."—p. 42; while his speeches "are of that quiet, *pious* kind which are best described by the common saying, 'It is *as good* as a sermon to hear them.'"—p. 43; nor that "a speech from Lord Mount Sandford is very much like what he often describes himself to have been in his youth, '*a harum-scarum chap.*"—p. 54.

Equally interesting and not more reverent are his descriptions of reverend speakers. Of Mr. Baptist Noel he says, "Whatever be his subject, he always touches it with the same accomplished refinement. *I have heard him describe a meal on the hind leg of a kangaroo* with as much grace and dignity as he would have dwelt on the destiny of an empire."—p. 78. On the other hand, the Master of the Temple is said to be "the *coldest looking man* I ever saw; not cold in feeling but in bodily aspect. He seems as if he had been frozen up, and was endeavouring to regain his vital warmth."—p. 85. Again, we learn that Dr. Croly "is built in the Cyclopean style of architecture;" that his gait, movements, expressions, ideas, are all in the gigantic style; that there is something vast and mysterious about him; that "his countenance has a strange antique appearance, well according with the antediluvian kind of majesty which clothes his figure;" that he is like "a thoroughbred gentleman just come from the moon;" that "to comprise his general exterior in a few words, *he is very like a brother of the Three Fates from the Parthenon.*"—pp. 87—91. Dr. Croly is drawn not only as an orator on the platform but in the pulpit, where ordinarily "he stands nearly motionless, or, resting his hands on the sides of the pulpit, *he swings to and fro, with his head projected forward, almost in the manner of a Roman catapult on its side supports.*"—p. 89. Of Dr. Duff, of the Scotch Kirk, we are told that he is "the *brightest star* that has appeared in the month of May for some years. No single speaker attracted so much attention, nor *drew forth such perpetual plaudits* during the last *season.*"—p. 95.

The variety of these sketches is not their least merit, as we have prepared our readers to expect. Different from all the foregoing speakers is the celebrated Mr. Wolff. We are informed that "he is far from tall, and his person is very stout. His hair is of a deep red colour, very thick and long, often falling on his collar;" his complexion is very dark, his eyes small and twinkling, his English unintelligible to many ears, his utterance rapid, and his delivery in a shrill chanting tone.

> "His action is wild and exuberant in the extreme: he frequently assumes a kind of dancing movement, holding up both his arms to their full extent, and shaking all his fingers; then he clasps his hands on his breast, and steps quickly backwards and forwards; then, perhaps, lays hold of some friend, whom, in the warmth of the moment, he almost embraces, immediately starting away with a loud exclamation, and renewing his dancing action."—p. 102.

Mr. Stowell, of Manchester, presents a remarkable contrast with this singular man. "His face is large and broad;" "his eyes blue and laughing," and "his mouth, which is very wide, *garnished with splendid white teeth.*" We are told that "his images are striking, sometimes rather coarse, and his style often the most jocular, *even to broad comic effect;*" that "no speaker more frequently *sets the Hall in a roar,*" and that it is a question "which makes the most noise in proportion, Mr. Stowell or his audience."—pp. 112, 113. We are further told,

> "Those who have heard Mr. Stowell will allow that no man is more completely calculated for popularity among mixed audiences. His zeal for the Established Church, his vehement Protestantism, his free,

strong mode of speaking, his loud voice, merry face, and humorous anecdotes, give him a perpetual untiring interest with them. He appears every year, and at almost every meeting, yet no man is a greater favourite; they are never wearied with applauding him, and always cheer him rapturously."—pp. 113. 114.

Other sketches are equally brilliant, as of "*that splendid binary star*, M'Ghee-and-O'Sullivan;" of Mr. Cumming, with a person "not exceeding five feet four or five," and a "complexion resembling *alabaster with a deep damask colour;*" of "good Mr. Seymour," who tosses his head up and down, when speaking, with such animation, that a young lady observed, that he looked "as if *he had been half scalped by the Indians,* and had forgotten to have it fastened down again;" of Sir Andrew Agnew, whose features express "*despair,*" and who confesses "in a piteous tone" that he is "accounted the offscouring of all things;" of Sir Edward Parry, who "looks emphatically *a fine fellow;*" of Captain Gordon, whose voice is heard "distinctly above the tumult of two or three hundred men," and who "seems *as if he could outroar a lion as easily as he would out-argue a Jesuit;*" and of Mr. Stewart, (whom no one can mention without regretting that he with other excellent men should appear in such mixed company,) who "has a way of rising on tiptoe, with his arms elevated above his head, which has a peculiar effect, especially with his long, slender figure, and in this position he moves very much as if he were going to take wing and fly away."—p. 124. But we must not allow ourselves to enlarge on these and other inviting topics, lest room should be wanting for two or three extracts at length, which will give a much more vivid idea of the state of the meetings and the impressions they create than any thing that has yet been said.

The first shall be "*one of the perpetual favorites* of our London *audiences,* the Rev. H. H. Beamish, Minister of Trinity Chapel, Conduit Street."

"His popularity as a speaker is indeed well merited, for his talents are as varied as they are delightful; and in the two opposite departments of the pathetic and the humorous he has but few superiors.

"In person he is about five feet nine or ten inches high, and stout, but not inelegant, with a handsome countenance and a very gentlemanlike aspect. His hair is dark and thick, his complexion good, and his features well cut. He has dark blue eyes, full of the most vivid and various expression; I seldom see him without thinking of the poet's address to his country—

"Erin! the smile and the tear in thine eyes
Blend like the rainbow that hangs in thy skies.

"And not only is this the case with Mr. Beamish's own countenance, but he has an irresistible way of producing the same effect on yours.

His humour is so keen and natural, yet so refined, and his pathos so tenderly touching, that few speakers more frequently mingle ' the smile' with ' the tear' in the eyes of their hearers.

" He is always fluent and eloquent; his ideas are graceful, and his language appropriate, but his great *forte* lies in anecdote. He tells a story better than any one I know, (always excepting Dr. Cooke,) and he has at command an inexhaustible fund of them, Irish and English, tragic, comic and romantic.

" His voice is sweet and powerful, and his Hibernian accent is of the most polished order.

" He is, like most of his countrymen, what the old writers call ' a man of parts, that hath a subtle and a ready wit;' for he is never at a loss, cannot be taken by surprise, and cannot be put out of countenance. Twice only, in the innumerable speeches I have heard him make, have I ever seen him at all in perplexity, and one really enjoyed the sight, from its rarity.

" The first time was in a long self-defence, in which he laboured hard at a troublesome task, with but limited success; the second occasion was very amusing, for he got really set fast in the middle of an Irish love story. Simplicity is one of his characteristics; a compound feeling or action is not in his line, and he then had to set forth the attachment of a Protestant girl to a young Roman Catholic, in the light of a very pathetic affair, in which he wished us all to be deeply interested; and yet he had, at the same time, to keep up our horror of Popery itself; so that between compassion and blame, he got quite into a labyrinth, and hesitated considerably, a most unusual event.

" He saw also that his hearers were more amused at himself than distressed for his heroine, which a little annoyed him; though amidst his dilemma, he could scarcely help laughing. He persevered, however, till he got past the marriage of the ill-assorted pair, and then, as if to take his revenge upon us, he changed his style, and claiming an undeniable right to our sympathies, wound up one of the most tragic tales I ever heard, of persecution, misery, and madness, in his most harrowing manner.

" He is very fine in his style whenever he attempts it; but, perhaps, I may refer to his speeches at the Naval and Military Bible Meetings, as specimens of his most truly touching anecdotes; while his addresses at the various Irish anniversaries are equally good, as samples of drollery and real wit. I well remember, at a meeting in the west of England, when Mr. Beamish first came over as a speaker, the great amusement he excited by his definition of the word ' boys.' He was describing a visit he had paid to a mine or colliery, and speaking of the men employed there. ' So, when I saw the creatures all coming about us, I said, Now boys, sit down, and I'll tell ye something; for we call every thing *boys* in Ireland, old women and all, ye know.'

" Mr. Beamish, at his first settlement in London, had the Irish chaplainship of the West Street Chapel, St. Giles's, which belongs to the Irish Society; he had, indeed, relinquished his preferment at Kinsale, for the express purpose of preaching to his poor countrymen in their dear native tongue. In 1832, however, he gave up the Irish preaching, in consequence of his declining health; but why he has never resumed that interesting employment, since he has become so well capable of doing it with renewed strength, remains a mystery to most persons, notwithstanding the long self-exculpation before-mentioned. Some of his private friends declare themselves equally in the dark on this subject.

"Mr. Beamish's private character is amiable and delightful; he is an accomplished scholar and musician, and I cannot but think that he must be a poet, though I never heard the fact stated."—pp. 124—128.

As a suitable set-off to the above, we select the sketch of "Mr. John Hockin, *more familiarly known as 'the Brummagem Blacksmith.'*"

"I have heard loud voices, powerful voices, nay, stentorian voices; but none ever greeted my auditory nerves which could merit to be called more than *moderate* when contrasted with his. Even Captain William Wellesley's speaking-trumpet of a voice will not stand a comparison with it. It has, moreover, this wonderful peculiarity, that the louder it is raised, the more distinct becomes its articulation. At the greatest distance every word is as perfect as though spoken into your ears."—p. 178.

"I had gone into the Hall in the beginning of the day, with a friend, who was anxious to see some expected speaker. We saw the Bishops of London and Chester, Lord Teignmouth, and others, but not the person we sought; and as some inaudible gentleman was speaking, we soon departed, glad to escape the excessive crowd and want of air. We then passed some time in the Lower Hall, where another meeting was going on, and after an excellent speech from Mr. Beamish, we left the room to return home; but we had scarcely reached the main cross-passage, when we became sensible of an extraordinary sound, as though some energetic proclamation were being made in our very ears. We stopped to listen, but could not determine whence the noise came. We only knew that we had never before heard a similar one. We went up stairs, thinking that something extraordinary was taking place in the first-floor gallery; but we were astonished, on reaching that spot, to find the voice as far off as ever.

"We now turned towards the Great Hall and found that it was a speech being delivered there, and of which we clearly heard some words, we being on the *outside* of its walls. Determined to examine into the phenomenon, and knowing that the best approaches were too full to be attempted, we ascended the upper stairs, and on entering at the top of the raised seats, we found that the immense volume of sound proceeded from a dark, active little man, who stood on the platform, haranguing the multitude in tones of living thunder; bestowing, at the same time, by way of emphasis, such tremendous blows on the platform-rail with his clenched fist, as he had been wont to deal upon his anvil, in the way of his calling; for it was indeed no other than John Hocking, the chain and anchorsmith, the reformed drunkard, and at that time the overwhelming *cheval de bataille* of the Temperance Society.

"We looked at each other, sat down, and listened.

"His language was plain and course, but not ungrammatical, and he continued to detail facts, and to put vehement interrogatories to his hearers, all at the same pitch of voice; so that if we had remained on the outside, we need not have lost one word of what he said.

"Some of his narratives had a sufficient lack of refinement about them, and as others almost trenched on the confines of propriety, nothing could be more amusing than to watch the effect on those around him.

"The Bishop of Chester was in the chair, and while some looked up in amazement, and some looked down in a vain pretence of not hearing what the deaf must have heard, while some looked fatigued, and some looked annoyed, (amongst whom Lord Teignmouth's curly hair, uneasy look, and fidgetting movements were conspicuous,) the good Bishop, in the best possible spirit, laughed, nodded, and cheered, and evidently regarded the exhibition as quite *unique*, and admirable in its kind.

"Place the Bishop of Chester where you will, he always finds his proper level, and always keeps it; he takes all in good part, and never loses either his temper or self-possession. I doubt, however, whether his Lordship's ears have ever forgotten Mr. John Hockin.

"I only wonder how he, and the other sitters of that platform, survived the infliction, without a permanent deafness.

"Such a Niagara of an orator I never before heard, nor do I desire ever to hear such another."—pp. 178—181.

A third picture shall be added in a third style:—

"The painter who wishes to embody on canvass the *beau ideal* of a British Admiral, should paint the picture of Sir James Hillyar. His delightful countenance has all the proverbial openness, good humour, and jollity of an English tar, besides a something peculiar to itself, which makes it a pleasure look at him.

"The happy benevolence of his round, bronzed face, and smiling blue eyes, is set off by the thick, venerable white hair, which grows in profusion about his open forehead; and his manner has all the vivacity of seventeen, though I should guess his years to be probably seventy.

"He has only spoken once, I believe, on the London platforms, and that, as might be expected, was at a Naval and Military Bible Meeting, in Freemasons' Hall.

"His lively look, his familiar style of speaking, the strangely compounded materials of his speech, the irresistible ludicrosity of his comedy, and the deep pathos of his tragedy, will not soon be forgotten by those who heard him. The ladies, especially, doted on him; they called him "a lovely old gentleman," and took, in the best possible humour, his pathetico-comic addresses to themselves, under the complimentary title of "you young petticoats there!"

"He ended his speech very abruptly, and as he returned to his seat, was informed that he had forgotten to name the resolution he had been requested to move. Back he came to the front of the platform, with an indescribable drollery of eye and voice, saying, "It may seem very odd, that a man so unwilling to make one speech, should come back to ye to make another; but talking to the petticoats, I forgot my proper business; ah! that's always the way!" And he shook his head at the ladies, who laughed and blushed, and delighted in the old Admiral exceedingly.

"When Mr. Cumming came on, towards the close of the meeting, (for this was his Bannockburn day,) Sir James was in raptures with him, He sat just by him, and the vehemence with which he clapped his hands and applauded that eloquent address, was as great as if the young Scotchman had just captured a French ship of the line. When Cumming concluded, amid enthusiastic cheers from the assembly, he turned round to make his retreat and hide himself behind the chair; and in so doing he had to pass close to Sir James, who, raising his broad Neptunian hand, with a face that said in every feature, "Well done! my little hearty!" bestowed on Mr. Cumming's much-to-be-pitied shoulders, three such strokes of admiration as might be heard half way down the Hall."—pp. 154—156.

If we had not some confidence that the above extracts must interest our readers, we should be diffident about risking another; but, under the circumstances, we think just one more is allowable. It presents a striking subject for a tableau vivant or an H. B. At a district Visiting Meeting, Lord Chichester having to vote thanks to the chairman, Lord Cholmondeley, began to enlarge upon the benevolent exertions of the latter; the narrative proceeds:—

"Lord Cholmondeley's modesty was sadly shocked at hearing his own good deeds thus publicly set forth, and, blushing very considerably, he extended a hand to catch hold of his panegyrist, and stop any further commendations. But Lord Chichester, though looking full at the audience, contrived to see his friend's attempt, and resolved that his just tribute to retiring merit should not be interrupted; and he gently edged himself away sidelong, and pursued his eulogy. The *Praisee* stretched himself farther and farther, trying to seize the corner of his provoking friend's frock-coat, which hung, most temptingly, just beyond his reach; for the Praiser, with a face of the most innocent gravity, and as though quite unaware of the *Praisee's* efforts, kept softly stepping farther off, so as just to elude his grasp, while he continued his remarks as before. After stretching himself sideways, quite to his full length, and nearly losing his balance, Lord Cholmondeley gave up the attempt, and resigned himself to the more common-place expedient of covering his face with his hands.

"Lord Chichester concluded his speech, and then sat down, with a look that fully showed the drollery within. The Marquis rose immediately, half angry, half ashamed, and quite distressed; and disclaimed the praises bestowed on him in the humblest and most modest manner.

"Altogether it was a highly pleasing, as well as amusing scene, and those who witnessed it will not soon forget the dry, grave waggery of Lord Chichester, nor the mingled frown and laugh of the excellent Marquis."—pp. 44, 45.

Now we ask our readers whether the above passages have not abundantly proved the point for which they have been made. The religion of the day undeniably cannot propagate itself by religious means, but addresses itself to means which are not only independent, but even in violation of religion. The tawdry decorations, theatrical displays, and pseudo-mysteriousness of Romanism, at least carry with them a religious profession; but what is there of a religious character in exhibitions, which to a deaf person, or to one who was suddenly introduced to them without knowledge of the societies to which they belonged, taken at greatest advantage, would not differ at all, or scarcely, from those of any other meeting, political or other, which take place in the metropolis? Without making ridicule the test of truth, yet what is to be said when parties actually profess to be ridiculous and make fun of themselves? Though truth may be ridiculed, yet surely error alone plays the buffoon; and, with every wish to be cautious in what we say, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that, while Exeter Hall has throughout all its floors the dry rot of irreverence, some of its speakers are but stage players at best, and at worst actual drolls and merry andrews. Surely truth is not lacquied by Puck and Bottom, by flibberty gibbets, and goblin pages, abbots of unreason, and boy-bishops. It is too sacred a matter to be presented to the mind under any but sacred images, and in former ages none have ever done otherwise, but heretics or the lowest rabble. We will not draw the conclusion which seems to follow, but submit with every serious, and we will add kindly feeling, the above reflections to the frequenters or patrons of the meetings to which they relate. Voices " outroaring a lion," language " jocular even to broad comic effect," " the hall in a roar," " dancing movements," " wild gesticulations," " fashionable English costume," " agreeable gentleman-like action," " irresistible ludicro-solemn slyness," " roguish twinkles," and " hats and handkerchiefs flying," present but a sorry contrast to the " long and silent prayer," the " weepings and moanings," the " fear of God and orderly discipline," " the Metropolitan with his exhortation," and the " deacon in his albe" of the ancient Spanish council. For ourselves, we do not scruple to confess, that little as we like the playhouse, if we were compelled to go to one or the other, we would as lieve go thither as to this celebrated Hall on a show-day.

Art. IX.—*The Training System adopted in the Model Schools of the Glasgow Educational Society, a Manual for Infant and Juvenile Schools, which includes a System of Moral Training, suited to the Condition of large Towns.* By David Stow, Esq. one of the Secretaries of the Glasgow Education Society, and Author of "Moral Training." 12mo. pp. 234. Published by R. M'Phun, Trongate, Glasgow; and N. H. Cotes, Cheapside, London. 1836.

The work which stands at the head of this article, is one of a numerous class that has recently issued from the press on the subject of education. Scarcely any of these productions are from the pens of members of our own Church. The few which are so, consist of little more than abridgements, containing scanty and insufficient details, and give at best an imperfect notion of what requires above all things to be clearly and thoroughly understood. We have, therefore, been induced to select as the heading of this article, a book proceeding from the north, which has this recommendation for our purpose, that it professes to comprise the essence of whatever has been put forth by other writers, and to sum up what is good and desirable in their works. The connexion which the book, in name at least, has with a religious community of different principles from our own Church, will at once make it evident that we do not hold it up to admiration on account of any bearing it might be supposed to have on sacred things, or that we wished to infuse any of the spirit or principles of the kirk into the system of our own schools. But, even this caution is needless; for, in fact, there is nothing of religion in the manual of Mr. Stow. *Moral training* is the burden of his production, which may be fairly described, consistently with what he has said himself, as a condensation or adaptation of other men's thoughts, English and foreign as well as Scotch, and a simple enumeration of principles and practices by which we may most hopefully endeavour to influence the minds of the young. He has followed in the train of many others; and because he has profited by their errors, as well as their observations, he may be considered on the whole to have executed his task the best.

Most heartily do we wish that the Church of England at the present hour had a schoolmaster's manual for general use, of a comprehensive and perfect kind; a manual, we mean, that should embody, if not all the details, yet all the important principles of the different improvements and discoveries which have been made in the practical working and management of schools; which should distinguish the mere mechanism of a system of education, (the method and means which are employed,) from the springs by which such machinery is worked; which should preserve the everlasting principles of religion in their proper place, give them free play, assert the rightful authority they possess, and show how they, like the master-mind in the factory, must rule and direct the movements of the vast engine, while beams and mighty levers, and wheels within wheels, are subservient to their will and power, and which would adapt all such matter to the special and immediate necessities of the Church and the times in which we live. Such a work has been a manifest desideratum since the day that our bishops, with certain other benevolent persons, publicly associated themselves together for the promoting of the education of the poor in the principles of the Established Church, under the name of "The National Society." It is a want which continues to be felt to the present hour. We have had, indeed, for some time, it is true, the works of Dr. Bell put forth in various forms and under different names, as "Mutual Tuition and Moral Discipline," as "A Manual of public and Private Education," and as "Instructions for conducting Schools through the Agency of the Scholars themselves;" and we have had a motley and somewhat pigmy progeny, who owed their birth to his works, under diverse titles—"The System of Instruction for Masters in National Schools, by the Rev. F. Iremonger;" "The Practical Manual of the Madras System of Education," written by a schoolmaster while passing through the central school himself; "A Guide for Masters and Mistresses who propose to conduct Schools on the plan of Dr. Bell." But the variety of matter which it is here attempted to condense into the compass of a few pages, and the confusion between principles and practices which is apparent in all, except perhaps Mr. Iremonger's little work, the history of the system, and the incidents connected with the success of Dr. Bell, the irrelevant and controversial matter which is introduced in the form of notes, the superabundance of hard words and technical phrases,—"simultaneous instruction"—"reiterated and unreiterated spelling"—"syllabic and mono and poly-syllabic and promiscuous reading"—"reading by pauses and clauses"—"previous repetition of initiatory lessons," &c. to which are superadded chapters on the elements of arithmetic, on building and fitting up schools, on grammar, classical, and ladies' boarding schools, &c. are enough to confuse the mind of any but a very experienced practitioner. It is to us a matter of amazement how the National Society, with the use of such tools, has been able to accomplish the work, which we know, from the testimony of our own eyes and ears, it has done, but which we hardly could have credited on evidence of any other kind. We are far from denying that there are traits of genius or originality about the works of Dr. Bell which render them exceedingly valuable, and will always give them consequence in the history of education, but the good matter lies embedded in so deep and impenetrable a mass, that we should never dream of directing men, who are as yet unable to distinguish the rough ore from the earth, to attempt to draw their riches or resources out of such a mine.

To our apprehension, the subject is of first-rate importance. Next to an institution for the practical and experimental training of schoolmasters, and their proper instruction in the matters which they are to teach, which is the one thing needful for the success of any national scheme of education, we give the place to a manual for the schoolmaster's use. By such a book we mean a set of principles by which he may be governed in his professional career;—a work which (whether he may have been regularly trained for his office or not) will form a constant monitor and remembrancer of the motives by which he ought to be governed in the discharge of his duty; a guide which will prove to him what is settled and immovable in regard to education, because it is determined and laid down by God, and what is discretionary, to be adopted or not, according to the taste and requirements of the teacher, the wants of the children and the nature of the school;—where the mark is drawn to which in every case he must endeavour to attain, and proper limits defined, within which his own invention and that of others may be allowed to take their free range.

At the hazard of failing in a task which has hitherto baffled the attempts of abler and perhaps more experienced educationists than ourselves, we shall endeavour to describe the leading features of such a manual as we think is required for our national schools. We gladly contribute our mite to the treasury of the Church, and shall be happy if the discussion of the subject shall in any manner lead to the publishing of the book we require, or the rectifying and adapting for its purposes any book which the public may at present possess.

I. In the first place, we conceive that the teachers of our youthful population should be made to understand clearly the position in which they stand; that whatever may be the worldly advantages or inconveniences which surround them, their office is not only of an important, but in a moral and religious view, of a high and dignified nature, and their responsibilities are much greater than those of other men. They are not merely to frame and fashion the outward behaviour of youth, but they are helpers to the ministry of the Lord in the training up of immortal souls; they labour between the pastors and the lambs of the Lord's flock. They are to prepare the youthful mind for receiving the good seed which the appointed labourer in the vineyard is to sow and water that it may be blessed by God. It is important that they should consider and feel their own dignity in this respect, and, on the other hand, that they should be duly convinced of the subordinate nature of the occupation they are engaged in as not being teachers or ministers of religion themselves. But although they are not in the ministry, on their exertions and the success of their toil will in great measure depend the moral and religious character of the class for which they are now concerned. What then are the qualifications which such a class of men ought to possess? The answer to this inquiry involves another point on which the manual of the Christian schoolmaster ought to treat, and on this we are disposed to offer a few words.

II. In the judgment of every Churchman there are certain indispensable requisites connected, 1, with religious profession and belief; 2, with a regular, moral, and exemplary course of life; and 3, with the natural bias and turn of a man's disposition, without which it would be unreasonable to look for success in such an undertaking. That a man who offers himself for the management of a Church of England School, should be deliberately and from conviction a member of that Church, is almost a truism, though we apprehend that like some other matters which are self-evident when examined, it has not been generally inquired into, as it ought to be. We should wish to see a chapter in such a work as we contemplate, which, with some very little enlargement and comment, would bring home to a man's heart, who proposed to be a schoolmaster, such questions as these :—" Have " I, as a Christian, for my own personal edification, read the Bible " and considered the subjects it proposes with all the seriousness " becoming eternal things? Can I conscientiously recommend " and give a reason for such advice as this, viz. that baptism, private " prayer, public worship, confirmation, and the Lord's Supper, " should be attended to, and the formularies of the Church of " England be embraced? The tree will be judged of by its " fruits; has my life such manifest evidences of the principles by " which I am actuated as may assist in guiding all those who will " be influenced by my example into the way in which they ought " to go? Conduct which will pass without reproach in the " world may be very incapable of bearing the gaze and inqui- " sitive scrutiny of the young; children learn far more by imita- " tion than in any other manner, and are ever watchful for the " failings of one who is appointed to correct their own faults; " the inquiry, therefore, is by no means of a trifling kind; have I " the answer of a good conscience on this matter?" And then, if in these respects the result be satisfactory, the natural bent and disposition of one who sets up as a teacher and guide to others, is of the most important concern. An unfortunate defect in any of the bodily organs, natural infirmities of various kinds, a manner which is morose or reserved and shy, and other constitutional and unavoidable difficulties, may any of them frustrate the good intentions which a pious man may have formed. "Am I clear of "the charge of putting myself forward presumptuously against "manifest disqualifications such as these?"

III. The general principles which should govern a man in the undertaking of an office being settled, we think that some profitable and awakening reflections might be grounded upon the evil consequences of failing in his task; the reproach which may be brought upon religion; the abuse of benefactions given for the succour and improvement of the poor, offer considerations of weight by which an ingenuous mind would be affected; and still more impressive are thoughts connected with the anxious and reasonable expectations of parents for their offspring, and the all-important interests of the young ones themselves, and the irreparable loss which they sustain if their teacher is unequal to his work. A man might be checked in a thoughtless determination of engaging as a schoolmaster by such reflections,—or, if he had already undertaken the work, he might be stimulated to exertion by the suggestions which conscience would make with regard to them.

IV. Besides the arguments of this nature, it appears an office of charity and kindness to a man who is deliberating upon the choice of his profession, or who has determined to devote himself to scholastic pursuits, to set before him plainly and fully the dangers and difficulties by which he will be surrounded, as well as the encouragements which may cheer him in his course. At least let us give him the opportunity of counting the cost, and measuring the work before him, not by the groundless theories of a warm imagination, but by the sober and literal realities of the case. He will be removed from the influence of immoral society and its temptations, and led, by the nature of his office, to the performance of religious duties; but there is difficulty and danger in the kind of familiarity he will have with sacred things. The facts and arguments and books with which he is perpetually engaged may become less interesting to him every year; the freshness and elasticity of his spirits may fade away, and chilling coldness and indifference usurp a dominion over his soul. In many cases it may not be granted him to see the fruits of his labour, or to reap the harvest which he sowed. The heart will sicken when hope is deferred, and if the hands are once enfeebled, and the knees and limbs shake, the chill which comes over him will spread itself throughout his school, and the hope of better things hereafter will be lost. We are far from entertaining any unfavourable opinion of the success of education in the main; on the contrary, we are persuaded, that although a pious education be not universally successful in bringing children into a truly religious state, yet it is undoubtedly appointed by God for this end, and is, on the whole, more frequently attended with success than any other means of grace. But there are seasons when the harvest and vintage will fail, and a man must, in some measure, be prepared for these. His faith must be in God; he must be habitually a man of prayer; the supply of his strength must be continually descending from above; he must have confidence in his work, because it is the work of God, and because of the heavenly promise. And then, but then only, may he look forward with a hope that maketh not ashamed to the reward of his toil; his fidelity in the few things that pertain to the welfare of his little school shall be met with a far higher and more abundant reward than they deserve; and those he has turned to righteousness shall hereafter be as jewels in his heavenly crown that shall shine everlastingly in the kingdom of his Father. There are persons of our own communion, we believe, who from an apprehension of enthusiasm on the one hand, or hypocrisy on the other, are reluctant to invest the office of schoolmaster with the religious character which we assign to it here. To us it appears a sufficient answer to all the objections which can be offered of this nature, to observe that if a direct religious result is looked for by the education of the poor, the means must be adapted to the end desired. We should expect any schoolmaster we might employ, not only to teach the children to pray themselves, but to be fervent and earnest in commending them, by his own prayers, to God; and if this part of his duty were fully and effectually performed, we should conceive that there would be little room for dispute or difficulty as to the extent to which his other instruction in religion should go.

V. Although faith and piety be indispensable in a Church of England schoolmaster, yet all men equally pious and well-intentioned are not equally fit for that office. It appears to us, therefore, that it would be useful to single out the particular virtues and illustrate the proper manner of exercising them in the practical business and trials of a school. It is easiest to explain our meaning by examples, and doubtless an enlargement upon the few qualities we shall specify would furnish ample matter for a division of such a work as has been described.

The *patience*, for instance, of schoolmasters is especially tried; we would have it shown how essential to success the cultivation of this virtue is. The work of tuition must be gradual and slow in every stage; children are narrow-mouthed vessels into which a little only can be poured at a time. To hurry or to terrify them with a threat is to check the thoughtfulness we ought to endeavour to excite. Their minds are like soil of different depths, some of a nature to make the seed open at once, and others to retain it until the rain and the snow shall have come down from heaven and caused it to swell gradually and develope the principle of life which it contains. One secret of all good teaching may perhaps be summed up, and patience enforced by a single text,—"*the doctrine must drop as the rain and distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as showers upon the grass.*"

Humility is a grace of which teachers stand in special need. Their superiority over their daily companions, the absolute authority they enjoy, their temptations to display when they succeed, the pride and flattery of ill-educated parents, who find their children to be better scholars than themselves, the pomp and *puff* by which public examinations are too often marked, all render it expedient that the true grounds and principles of humility should be laid open to their view. *Sagacity and judgment* of a peculiar description are required in schools; the dealing with different dispositions, the interminable variety of petty cases which require to be settled, the necessity for promptness and decision in what is said or done, show the importance of faculties of this description, which, although in some respects properly accounted gifts, are capable of improvement and developement in those who possess them in the smallest degree. Again, *justice and equity* are properties which are called into exercise continually in a school; they are the life and soul of good discipline, and give a character to actions of the most trifling kind. Without these principles in active and constant exercise, decisions must be given through bias and prejudice which ought to be grounded on detached and independent facts; behaviour at one period will meet with the reward or the punishment which on some other occasion will be pardoned or overlooked; favouritism will usurp the place of impartiality, the private inconveniences or misfortunes of the teacher will be visited in anger upon the school, and among the children all confidence and respect for the decision of their master will die away. Mildness and forbearance, consideration and self-command, firmness and decision are intimately connected with the principles to which we here allude. And, then in addition to all these, there are *cheerfulness and good temper*, which are of the greatest necessity in conducting schools. There are principles upon which these qualities may be formed, habits which are favourable to their cultivation and growth, rules which are needful to prevent their abuse. Withal, there is a *dignity of manner* and of character which a schoolmaster ought always to maintain; there is a reverence and respect due to children, as well as to himself; there is a proper reserve to be exercised towards them, and a proper distance to be maintained, at the same time that candour and openness of manner are exemplified in his own behaviour, as well as taught by his words. It is a great matter to understand the foundation upon which all such conduct ought to rest, and the opportunities which exist for exercising it, and the profitable account to which those opportunities may be turned. We would merely notice further, before quitting this division, a few duties devolving upon schoolmasters, which give scope for exercising the principles we here treat of:—1, Caution in laying down rules; 2, a knowledge of the proper limits of authority; 3, an understanding of his proper station, as he is placed between the children and the promoters of the school; 4, proper methods of treating the children as responsible to their parents and to God; 5, right conduct towards the parents of the children themselves when they visit the school; 6, due influence over pupils who have ceased to attend his instructions and are settled in the world.

Every one, we are persuaded, must feel the advantage which a schoolmaster would possess who entered upon his office and the difficulties attending it, with a set of correct principles of action formed in his mind on these and other points, instead (as commonly is the case) of having to contend with embarrassing circumstances, and too often attain to right motives of conduct only by perceiving the ill effect of mistakes into which he has been betrayed.

VI. The remarks which have been hitherto made, relate to general principles of conduct towards all persons connected with the institution over which he is appointed to preside. The particular business of the school itself should be equally conducted under the guidance of settled rules; motives of conduct for all occasions of ordinary occurrence should be understood and thought on till they appear to have become a habit and a part of the mind, and the every day routine of educational business should be conducted in subservience to them. It is far too commonly the case that a man is supposed to be formed into a schoolmaster so soon as he knows the methods of arranging and classifying children, of distributing lessons and keeping the *marked-books,* and the registers of the school, and of taking and losing places in a class, with such like formal details of the mere mechanical routine of a national school. But, we scruple not to affirm, that whatever assistance these practices may furnish, under the guidance of principles, they are absolutely worthless in themselves—they can at best only serve to conceal the want of a proper system of education, and to defer the disclosure of the evil to a future day, when the opportunity for remedying it is passed.

What is important in the world, is equally so in schools, and we could wish that on all occasions the difficulties should be strongly and clearly represented to the mind of him by whom they ought to be overcome. For this reason only, and not in any manner as an objection to schools themselves, we should think it right to insist, (in such a work as we refer to) even at considerable length, on the following facts:—1, That the proper scene for moral and religious probation and training is home (not school), that school at best can only be regarded as an auxiliary to the parents in the discharge of their duties, and never can supersede the necessity for what they ought to do themselves; 2, that it is a very serious objection to schools that religion must, in a great measure, be taught in them as a task; 3, that it must be given, not, from time to time, as the fitting opportunity arises, or as food convenient for the bodily necessities is taken in, to satisfy the cravings which nature makes, but it is taught as a form; and 4, that the same truths are taught to children who have, indeed, pretty nearly the same mental powers, but whose religious affections differ probably as decidedly as the colour of their clothes; and since it is on the condition of the heart rather than the head, that the success of all religious teaching depends, the instruction is not given (to say the least) under circumstances the most favourable for success. A conviction of such difficulties as these will dispose the intelligent school-master to look out for the best remedies which the experience of others may have suggested, or his own observation may devise for these inherent and natural defects in every large and flourishing school. He must bear in mind that every evil may be mitigated, if it cannot be cured. Much may be done by contrivance to vary the irksomeness of lessons, and bring sound doctrine with proper freshness and attractiveness before the mind;—mechanical repetitions of serious truths, which are often resorted to for the mere purpose of gaining a power or habit of distinct articulation, may be entirely set aside, and the desirable faculty of a clear enunciation created by exercises of a different kind; the individual characters of children may be studied; a variety of occupation may be sought which shall divest the school instruction of the formality and pedantry by which it is too often characterised; and, through the medium of the clergy and visitors of the school, a very considerable corrective influence may be exercised upon the parents, as well as the scholars, the effects of which will soon be apparent, and strengthen the hands of the teacher in carrying out improvements of the most important nature.

VII. We hold that with reference to the direct business of a school, a great deal might be said with advantage on the following points, treating them, as we have before observed, not as mere objects of attainment in order to the exhibition of a well managed school, but as principles, by the operation and enforcement of which the school itself is to be made such as it ought to be. 1, *Order*, for instance, is not only desirable in itself for the comfort and benefit of all parties who are shut up together in a room for six hours in a day, but it may be made to have a direct moral influence over the mind; 2, of *neatness* and *cleanliness*, of *delicacy* and *politeness*, the same may be said; 3, *quietness* requires an exercise of self-command on the part of children, as well as affording them ease and assisting in a proper intonation of voice while their exercises are performed together in a busy room; 4, *obedience*, as a religious principle, is never to be lost sight of or trifled with, although the schoolmaster were willing to forego the comfort which results from having his own commands observed at once; 5, *attention* is indispensable for the present success of the school; but a volatile unsettled humour, if not gently altered and wisely corrected in early years, will have an unhappy influence through life, and hinder the attainment of any great excellence in whatever business may be undertaken. 6, *Intelligence* and *animation* characterise the proceedings of one school, while dulness and heaviness oppress the operations of another which is situated, perhaps, in the very next village or adjoining street. The ground of difference may not be in the attainments of the master, or even of the children themselves, but in other causes, which it is especially desirable should be set forth and illustrated from real life. After the same manner it is very expedient that the right use and improvement, 7, of *memory* should be understood; that parrot-like exercises should cease in our schools, and that such measures should be systematically adopted as will engage the understanding in the exercise of learning by heart, which is too commonly an operation of the most mechanical and unintellectual nature it is possible to conceive. 8, The management of *teachers*, the things they are capable of doing, and those which it is unfit they should do, the limits of their authority, the relative position they hold with regard to the other boys, the principles upon which they are to be selected, the advantages and disadvantages to which they are exposed, are matters of the utmost importance to be understood aright. It is by far too common to select teachers with a respect exclusively to their intellectual powers, rather than give a due consideration of the moral and constitutional qualities of the individual selected; they are seldom made to understand that the trust and authority reposed in them can only be adequately discharged by their affording themselves an example of general good conduct in the school; it is seldom understood by schoolmasters that the habits of accuracy, the mental discipline, the frequent appeal to their own resources do far more than compensate to the monitor for the time and labour he is induced to bestow on the improvement of his companions. But if these things, which are essential to the free and full working of the system of mutual instruction were generally apprehended, a variety of acknowledged abuses would be avoided;—many weak and absurd objections, which are sometimes urged against the national system, would cease to be heard, and a practical evidence would be constantly at hand, in the actual condition of the whole company of teachers belonging to a school, to contradict the surmises of speculators, who condemn a system which they probably have neither studied, nor tried, nor even seen properly applied. 9, It is too little remembered in superintending a school, that the master ought not only to be able to direct, but to be capable of practically executing all his own commands in a manner superior to any one else. It has been said that the teacher should be in his place like a fugle-man before soldiers, exhibiting every movement and grace with which their exercises should be performed. The remark is in some respects true also of the master of the school himself. This, at all events, he must especially observe, that he never should violate the rules by which his youthful deputies are bound to act; that he should himself do every thing in the same manner and by the same means that he requires it to be done by them. Schoolmasters too commonly speak of reserving to themselves a liberty of breaking their own rules, which is almost fatal to the efficiency and steadiness of lads who are restricted in the means which they may use. No youth will believe but that a liberty of varying the method of enforcing his wishes would facilitate his labour, and there are few who will not take the first opportunity, when they are unobserved, of trying some experiment of this nature for themselves.

VIII. When, by the preceding, or various similar methods, and by the inculcating of those principles upon which such things depend, the general conduct of the schoolmaster towards those with whom he is concerned is properly regulated, and the special business of the schoolroom is satisfactorily arranged and settled, we conceive that it might be desirable that a schoolmaster's manual should offer certain hints and well digested advice as to methods in which his moral and religious influence over his pupils might be enforced or extended. We gather the idea from Bishop Wilson in his rules for the petty schools in the Isle of Man, that private, and occasionally public exhortation in his schoolroom, may be employed with good effect for the benefit of the children. Something certainly may be taught this way of the duties of self-examination and self-government, and gratitude towards those from whom kindnesses are received; a variety of casual circumstances arising out of the ordinary business of the school may furnish the *mollia tempora fandi*, when the doctrine or duty which is inculcated will come home to the heart of a child. It is especially desirable, that in this manner the learning of the school should be connected with domestic concerns and the every day affairs of life. Without launching forth into declamation or being suspected, by the most cautious, of interfering with the preacher's office, the general habits of the man may serve as a powerful comment on any words of exhortation he may use to inculcate a reverence for the Bible, a desire after the knowledge of its contents, a peculiar solemnity of feeling in reference to the great doctrines of salvation which it propounds; his pursuits on the Lord's day, the cheerful character which he gives to the lessons of that day; the arrangements which he makes, without observation or display, to lessen the tedium of school attendance and public services, which children are naturally so apt to feel, his efforts to give interest and infuse piety into the services they are called upon to pay to God, the advantage he may take for creating some variety on occasion of the festivals and special services of the Church, these may produce impressions favourable to virtue and religion, which the scoffings of the world and all carnal allurements shall afterwards (by the help of God) assail in vain; and particularly, if he can succeed in creating a habit of prayer, and a system of dependence upon the help it brings, and a love of communion and access to God, he will have obtained the best possible security for the present and future well-being of the individual for whom he is concerned.

IX. The subject of *Discipline* opens a large and entirely new field, in which the best possible service may be done to our schools by the writer or compiler of such a work as we desire to obtain. Various methods of reward and of punishment in every form and degree are proposed in a desultory and incomplete manner in the books to which we have already referred. But the subject undoubtedly requires an extent of consideration and of systematic arrangement to which we can hardly do more than allude.

1. The proper principles to which a Christian should appeal in the enforcement of all discipline ought certainly to be understood; and the rule of gentleness and love, which was inculcated in the gospel, and exemplified in the series of constraining encouragements with which the sermon and exhortation of our

blessed Lord began, ought, in the first place, to be faithfully and fully tried.

2. The vehemence of the passions and affections of the young, and their want of experience and of reasoning power, should be carefully considered and thoroughly investigated before any violent remedy is applied by unskilful hands. A distinction must be carefully drawn, and uniformly observed, between the habits of vice and wickedness which are settled and rooted in the heart, and the sallies of petulance, the unmeasured esteem for trifling kindnesses, and the sudden outbreakings of hatred and revenge, which sometimes proceed almost as much from the irregularities of the body or the blood, as of the heart.

3. There is undoubtedly a proper mode of dealing with children suited to their peculiar infirmities and their age, which, if it is not adopted at all times and seasons, ought at least to be recognised and acknowledged in the school as the method most suitable to the inmates and the place. The schoolmaster of old gave the liveliest illustration of it by causing the pictures of joy and gladness to be painted around his room. And assuredly it is a duty to render education as little unpleasant as we can; enticements and encouragements are never more completely in their right place, than when the dulness of the head and the perverseness of the heart are to be overcome. Gloom and moroseness are unsuitable to the feelings and sympathies of children, and render them suspicious of the subject and instruction which is brought forward in such an uninviting and repulsive form.

4. Again, it is particularly needful, at the present time, that the real principle of emulation, the extent to which it may with propriety be employed, and the object and design of its use at all, should be rightly explained. A re-action has begun to take place with regard to this useful auxiliary in the management of school business, and because of the abuse of the principle some benevolent promoters of education threaten us with the exclusion of it altogether from their schools. And, no doubt, if the losing places in a class and an appeal to emulation is to be made the sovereign remedy in every case, the decision of such persons may be judicious. If there is nothing in the view of the child beyond the mere outward honor or disgrace of rising or falling in the ranks of his competitors, it is time that emulation as a part of the national system were done away. But we think that it might easily be explained and understood, even by the children themselves, that in a class of scholars *generally* equal as to their abilities, some trifling differences will always exist; that according to these differences, each one among them might have his proper place assigned him in the ranks. That in such an arrangement there

would be no personal honour in standing at the top of the class, and no disgrace in standing last, for each would hold the rank which had actually been assigned to him by Providence—i. e. by God. But, the children being thus arranged, if it were to appear after the temporary absence of the master that one scholar had risen, and another had fallen above or below the place which each was qualified to hold, then their respective positions in the class would show the comparative attention or idleness with which he had behaved during that time. It is to this extent only, or at most, as a subsidiary index of the fluctuations which take place in the progress of children who are nearly equal in scholarship, that we think emulation should be used.

5. We shall be easily betrayed into too great length if we follow out the subjects which present themselves under this division to our minds. We will only say that a number of invaluable materials for thought and reflection, as connected with discipline, might be furnished to the schoolmaster by discussing such topics as these; that in correcting a fault we should seek and aim at correcting the motive from whence the transgression proceeded; that the ultimate good of the offender and his companions in the school should be the object we always keep in view, that we should endeavour to prevent a habit of ill-humour, and avoiding whatever irritates the feelings, consistently with our authority and firmness, should as often as possible assign a reason for any system of acting we may adopt, if it is known to be disagreeable to a child. The diverting of attention and the calling forth into exercise and action some different and countervailing affections of the mind, are frequently of service in the rectifying of the temper or heart. In timid, nervous children the truth of this remark is apparent, and the remedy to be applied when they fail should certainly be adapted to their state. Children should be treated with considerable respect, should always be deemed innocent until guilt is proved: should be addressed at all times as if under those religious promises and obligations which were made for them when they were dedicated to God. A sense of delicacy with a tender and open conscience is to be cultivated in them with all possible care. The difficulties which in large schools arise from the intermixture of pupils, though in some degree doubtless they always will exist, yet admit of being mitigated or obviated, like evils of every other kind, and we would gladly see some sober remedies proposed for this purpose. *Praise* and *blame*, their just and moderate use as stimulants, would come within the subjects we desire to see discussed as part of discipline, together with the proportionate importance which we are justified in attaching to excellence of an intellectual as compared with that of

a moral or religious kind. Hope and fear; punishment and reward; corporal punishment for moral offences, the extent to which a spiritual or a literal meaning is to be assigned to those texts of scripture which speak of *the rod,* the degree in which gospel principles may have banished the necessity for recourse to such remedies, or the extent to which they may have been permitted in ancient times, because of the hardness of men's hearts; expulsion, the last resource, like the cutting off the limb and leaving it to perish, that the life with the body may be preserved, these and a multitude of other points would easily be enumerated if the limits of our space would permit.

10. And besides all these, we think it would be highly convenient, if at the conclusion of such a work as we propose a small variety of specimens were given of the method of keeping common school registers and books, the notices in use for the parents when the children break the rules; plans for the arrangement of the lessons and distribution of time, subjects of study arranged according to the proficiency and age of children in classes, with the names of various institutions in which the plans described, or something similar, might be seen in operation. Nor would we omit to add to such a book a few suitable prayers and hints for the religious exercises, in private, of the persons for whom it was especially prepared, together with a short list of books, which every schoolmaster might be expected to have procured and have ready for use in supplying such further information as he might require. But already perhaps we have been led into needless and unprofitable detail; and in the pursuit of the remedy for a want which we have long experienced, have lost sight of the object which was in view when these remarks were commenced. We intended to have dwelt more at length on the work which we mentioned at first, and to have used it for illustrating the particular nature of our own urgent wants. But the scheme or outline which had arranged itself before our imagination has got possession of the pen, and we must confine ourselves to a few extracts only of passages which we are most disposed to approve in the production of Mr. Stow.

Perhaps there is rather more of new contrivance and attempt at originality in the work of this gentleman, than in what we desire to see prepared for English schools. He has endeavoured to cull every thing which is excellent in schools of *every description,* and to adapt the fruits of his ramble to his own use. The description is interesting, and we doubt not the mechanism and arrangements of the Glasgow Model School are efficient, and deserve the reputation which we are assured it has already acquired; but we very much question whether some parts of the plan of Mr. Stow do not involve an extent of personal labour and continued exertion, which are quite unsuited to the constitution of ordinary English schools, and we believe also of the generality of Scotch schools. Like our own institutions, they are managed by a single teacher, who cannot preside with effect through the whole day, and consequently they are unprovided with the apparatus that the *training system,* so called *par excellence,* requires. The adaptation of the infant school practices and the system of combining them with those of the ordinary juvenile schools; the watching of the children while at play, with a view to the understanding of their character and propensities; the *covered* and the *uncovered* school-room, with the teaching in the gallery and the lecture or exercise by elipsis; constitute the chief peculiarities of the system recommended by Mr. Stow, and pursued at Glasgow. It will have been seen that, like him, we had contemplated the study of individual character, the formation of habits, and a kind and degree of moral and religious influence on the part of the schoolmaster, which we regret is not generally obtained; but we think that more feasible methods might be devised for such purposes than those which the Glasgow seminary proposes, excellent as they undoubtedly are in themselves. Our principal objection to Mr. Stow's *publication* is grounded on the inordinate quantity of matter and variety of subjects which he has pretended to embody in the compass of a duodecimo of rather more than 200 pages; the work is not digested and arranged with perspicuity, though the matter itself is generally intelligible and clear, and the recommendations that are given very often evince a sagacity and penetration which would lead to the supposition that he is well acquainted with the practice as well as the theory of schools, and the general condition of the working classes, for whose benefit the schools are designed. We shall strengthen some of the propositions we have announced in our scheme of a Christian schoolmaster's manual by the results of his observation, and the conclusions to which he has come.

On the importance of applying the doctrines and precepts of religion to regulate the mind and life of children, he writes,—

> "We all know and feel the power of habits which gradually form a *second nature,* and yet where are the seminaries for training to good and proper habits? Almost all that is aimed at in week-day elementary schools is head-knowledge. Moral habits are left to form themselves, or to be formed in the streets, or by the transient hour or half-hour of the morning and evening which parents can afford at home."—p. 18.

And again, at p. 151.

> "We must also keep in view that the cultivation of the religious and

moral sentiments and habits is the primary object of the training system, as it ought to be in every system of education; and that time and practice alone enable any man to meet and surmount all the difficulties which, day by day present themselves in the moral training of a week-day school."

With regard to rendering the business of the school-room as pleasurable as possible to the pupils, he observes,—

"In every lesson, it is of great importance that every point be vividly pictured out to the child in such a manner as to give a reality to the subject or word presented to the child's attention. Some wander so far from their subject, that the original topic is lost sight of; others adhere so rigidly and drily to it as to deprive themselves of the natural associations and analogies, which tend to give it greater vividness and interest, and to rivet it in the memory."—p. 52.

And again, p. 160.

"School books are almost all too didactic and abstruse. The chief books wanted are one or two cheap collections for ordinary (not scriptural) reading in schools, for children seven or eight years of age or upwards, consisting of extracts from general science, and each extract illustrated by a picture."

The simplicity and plainness which become a teacher are properly enforced.

"We doubt not but some individuals will say this style of catechising, or *exercising rather,* (it is the method by elipsis to which he refers,) is too childish and simple. Now, we acknowledge that it is both simple and child-like, though not childish. Simplicity is our aim, and it is the feelings and thoughts and actions of children that we propose to develope and regulate. The difficulty has not been the want of comprehension on the part of the children so much as the abstruse manner frequently of putting questions. Using words above the comprehension of children is quite as absurd as to speak in a foreign tongue."

On memory his remarks may be taken as in illustration of those which we have made.

"Every lesson ought to pass first into the understanding; that is, the child ought not to commit it to memory in the first instance, and then afterwards have it explained, for the mere words are, to a certain extent, a barrier to the understanding, when got by rote; but reverse the process, and the increased effect is very apparent. If any list of answers or a few verses are to be committed to memory, let the children be first exercised upon the meaning, &c., and then, but not till then, may they commit the words in regular order."—p. 162.

Mr. Stow is well aware of the principles needful to be observed for exciting intelligence in a school; he tells us very justly, that the mere amount of instruction is not so much the object as its nature and quality, and the habit of considering, reflecting, and reducing to practice what is taught and read; and, that—

"There are several faults into which teachers are likely to fall; one is that of telling too much to their pupils; they may receive the information with pleasure and appear to profit by it; but a great evil arises from such a mode of instruction; their minds remain almost passive, and they acquire a habit of receiving impressions from others at a time when they ought to be gaining mental power by the exertion of their own faculties."—p. 133; 178.

His view of the duties and office of the parent and of the subsidiary nature of a school, in filling up a void which might be supplied far better by the father or mother, under a perfect state of things, is precisely in accordance with our own.

"We trust it will not be imagined for a moment that we undervalue parental instruction and training at home. We have already stated our sentiments on this subject, and at the same time shown the extreme, nay insurmountable, difficulty the working classes labour under, in towns, in the moral training of their offspring."—p. 120.

On the necessity of exercising discretion in giving praise he has a useful note, p. 131.

"It is but too common a practice to call a child good because he gives a right answer, thus confounding intellectual truth and moral virtue."

On emulation and the usual method of exciting it he justly observes,—

"In some points such intellectual stimulants are a barrier to moral training, from the feelings they engender. The struggle in school is generally transferred to the conduct at home, and may be detected in the habit of detraction and finding fault. We would use stimulants when it can be clearly seen that no sacrifice is made of the amiable and moral qualities.

"Ambition is a noble principle implanted in our breast by our Creator for wise purposes; and in Scripture we are called upon to be ambitious. Some, therefore, would argue that struggling for prizes in school must be a right exercise of this principle. The analogy however does not hold good; for the Scriptural prize is one which all may obtain, and in no case engenders any feelings which would tempt us to seek the downfal or failure of our neighbour or companion."—p. 144.

Of punishments also he says, in accordance with the remarks which had occurred to us,

"Though we by no means dispense with punishment, but, on the contrary, follow in its spirit the precept of Solomon, yet we ought to state that the *literal rod* has not been used in the Model Juvenile School during the last two years and a half. Social sympathy and the united effects of the training in the play-ground, gallery, and by objects, have rendered corporal punishment comparatively unnecessary. Bringing a child who has offended into the middle of the floor, with his face turned towards or away from the rest of his companions, is found to be a severe punishment. To punish children by confining them in school after it is dismissed, or to cause them to read, for the same reason, three or four long chapters of the Scriptures, or commit to memory a few verses, or write an additional essay, is the direct way to train children to hate the school, their Bibles, and their lessons. What we desire children to love ought never to be associated in their minds with punishment."—p. 146.

We have quoted more than enough for the illustration of our own design, and sufficient, we trust, to draw attention to the importance of the subject. We should sincerely rejoice to see the work, which is so great a desideratum in our schools, proceed from any quarter, and obtain, as it undoubtedly would do forthwith, the sanction of the respectable body which presides over education within the pale of the Church of England.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Since our last number the long anticipated Life of Mr. Wilberforce by his Sons has made its appearance; we hope to have an early opportunity of reviewing it, meanwhile it will be enough to notice, what is on the surface of the work, the exceedingly great pains which have been spent upon it, and its importance as an addition to the historical records of the times to which it belongs.

The most important theological work which has lately appeared is Mr. Palmer's Treatise on the Church, which also will, in due time, receive from us the careful attention which it claims from all Churchmen. Whatever judgment be formed of the conclusions to which he has come on the variety of points which he has had to consider, we cannot contemplate without admiration, and (if it were right) without envy, the thorough treatment which his subject has received at his hands. It is indeed a work quite in character with the religious movement which has lately commenced in different parts of the Church, displaying a magnificence of design similar to that of the Bishop of London's plan of fifty new Churches, and Dr. Pusey, of Oxford's, projected translation of the Fathers.

This latter arduous undertaking, we rejoice to know, is now beginning to show fruit, the original text of St. Austin's Confessions, for which five Oxford MSS. have been collated or re-collated, is now through the press, all but the index; the translation also will issue from the press in the course of a short time, as will also the translation of St. Cyril, of Jerusalem. A portion of St. Chrysostom's Comment on St. Paul's Epistles has been printed since Christmas; but an important reason for suspending it has lately occurred in the researches which have been made into the Paris MSS. which Montfaucon used in the Benedictine text. Nothing has been found to throw suspicion on his theological honesty, but enough to show that readings may be materially improved by re-collation. Re-collations are proceeding for the same reason in the Oxford text of St. Cyprian; but they will not interfere with the translation, which is ready to go to press at once. Meanwhile Mr. Bickersteth has brought out an interesting little volume of portions of the works of the Fathers of the first and second Century. The work is conceived in the best spirit, and can but elicit kind and respectful feelings even from those who consider that Mr. Bickersteth does not enjoy in full measure the pure light of catholic truth. May there be less difference year by year between such men as him and them, and we think he is taking the way to fulfil the wish!

In Oxford, Mr. Parker's series of select Religious Works continues. Bishop Taylor's Golden Grove, Archbishop Laud's Devotions, Bishop Patrick's Heart's Ease, Dr. Sutton's Meditations on the Lord's Supper, and Hymns from the Paris Breviary, have already been published. These volumes present an appearance most appropriate to their contents, being beautifully printed and embellished, yet without an approach to the bad taste of the day. We are not quite satisfied with the judgment on which the Breviary Hymns are edited. A *selection* has been attempted; now this seems to be impossible. In such compositions Romanism obtrudes itself sometimes in a mere word, where the hymn is otherwise catholic and beautiful; and thus reduces a selector to the dilemma of omitting it altogether, or of seeming to countenance what is erroneous. We incline to think that in a second edition, which we hope soon to see, *all* should be printed, and the task of discriminating between them, which is not difficult, left to the reader. It is a curious coincidence, considering how little Dr. Sutton's works have been known of late years, that while his Meditations were publishing at Oxford, his Disce Mori (Learn to Die) has appeared in London, without any understanding between the respective editors. Our readers will not be sorry to have had this little work also warmly recommended to their attention.

Archbishop Laurence has published a third edition of his celebrated Bampton Lectures, also of his Treatise on Baptism, which is scarcely equal to them, and of his Translation of the Book of Enoch.

The little tract called " A Catechism on the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," has, in the course of a few months, reached a third edition. As its sale shows, it is well adapted to distribution. In connection with which, though with no real connection beyond that of subject, may be mentioned a small Catechism, " Of Scriptural Episcopacy," published at Belfast. It contains much information in the course of a few pages.

A volume of Poems has been published at Oxford called the Cathedral, with a number of elegant wood cuts. These Poems have obscurities, as a great deal of poetry must have, and ever has had; but we are greatly mistaken if they have not a long course of prospective influence in store for them.

No. 81 of the Tracts for the Times, which has been long expected, has at length appeared, and forms, by itself, a volume of above 400 closely printed pages. It is a catena of our divines on the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and is preceded by an historical sketch of the doctrine in our Church during the last 300 years. It completes vol. iv. which, though the longest, contains fewer Tracts than any of the former. We wish to draw particular attention to the deep thoughts contained in No. 80, on the right mode of preaching the Gospel.

The first volume has appeared of a uniform edition of the Theological Works of that lamented prelate and most excellent man, Bishop Van Mildert.

We grieve to have to notice that Dr. Faussett, Margaret Professor, who is favourably known to the world by a volume of Bampton Lectures before he was Professor, and a sermon against Mr. Milman since, has preached and published a Sermon against Mr. Froude's Remains. We trust this ill-advised step will not plunge the University into a new controversy. It is indeed deplorable that at a time when our enemies are at our gates, Dr. Faussett, without being able to point out one doctrine of our Articles or Prayer-book as infringed, should choose such a moment above all others for suddenly breaking silence in an attack on some of our Church's most devoted sons. No step more acceptable than his to Dissenters and Papists, Liberals and Destructives, can be conceived; and the more so as taken by a man who, however he himself may draw subtle distinctions, is in *their* eyes quite as much a bigot and a formalist as those whom he attacks. At this time of day the word of no one man, unsupported either by argument or by appeal to authority, can stop the course of thought in the University, or deter inquiring minds from following the paths of Hooker, Andrews and Bull, or of their masters, Irenæus or Cyprian. It is understood that a letter is being addressed to him by Mr. Newman. Before our next number it is to be hoped this lamentable affair will be at an end.

Dr. Adams, of Cambridge, Lady Margaret's Preacher, has published a Treatise to show that the "sealed book" in Rev. v. 1. is the Old Testament; that its unsealing is still to come, and will be equivalent to a new revelation; that its authentic copy was carried from Jerusalem to Rome, is still in the Vatican, and when brought to light will be the means of converting the Jews.

Various volumes of Sermons, some from distinguished persons, have been published in London during the last quarter. Bishop Mant's Sermons, on the Church and her Ministrations (Rivingtons), are but a specimen of what that excellent man is and has been all through his life, a witness for catholic truth against innovation and heresy.—Dr. Moberly's "Practical Sermons" (Rivingtons) unite singular clearness and exactness of thought, with the earnestness and profitableness which their title promises.—Mr. Smith's, preached at the Temple Church (Fellowes), are sound Sermons, sometimes deep, and sometimes rather dry, on the subjects to which he limits himself. It is that limitation which occasions this dryness so far as it exists.—Though we have pleasure in agreeing with Mr. Melvill on many most important points, there certainly are others on which we differ from him. Yet in spite of this we should feel his

Sermons (Rivingtons) as impressive as they are beautiful, were it not for his never-ending use of the word "we," "we," "we;" which, as often as it occurs, unpleasantly draws one back from his subject to himself, and makes his volume like a series of reports of speeches and sermons extracted from a newspaper.

In Mr. Harness's Sermons (Moxon) there is much that is sensible and useful, and "calculated for being read aloud in families," which he proposes as his object in publishing. When, however, he calls the Church "a party," p. 81, and the Lord's day "the Sabbath," p. 272, he shows himself tainted with the religious peculiarisms of the day. Nothing is more common in every age than sacrificing one part of Christian truth to another; or buying off general strictness of life by attention to one particular duty. At present this temper shows itself in endeavouring, by laying a stress on the duty of sanctifying a seventh of our time, to make up for the neglect of all other positive ordinances, such as the Apostolical Succession, Church Communion, the Priesthood, Sacramental Grace, and Tithes and Offerings. We do not mean to include Mr. Harness in this censure, but are speaking of the system to which he has in one point given in. It is this circumstance which makes Sabbath Societies, Sabbath Bills, &c. so *hypocritical*, if we may use the word; "these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone."

Mr. Bennett's Sermons (Cleaver) are not to be confounded with the run of such publications at this day, than which nothing can be more feeble. They are the composition of an able and thoughtful mind, and contain earnest and practical remarks, clothed in plain and natural language. However, they are not written as if he had a clear and consistent grasp of the truth. We do not mention as more than symbols of what we mean, that he, too, calls the Lord's day the Sabbath, that he confuses together the Catholic and Sectarian ascetics of the Primitive ages, and quotes Doddridge and Chrysostom in the same Sermon.

Mr. Fulford's Course of Plain Sermons on the Ministry, Doctrines, and Services of our Church (Rivingtons), are among the pleasing evidences of the growth of sound Catholic principles among what are called "the working Clergy." Here is a laborious parish priest, showing that it is possible to stand his ground in a mixed population without sacrificing principle. His Sermons contain a good deal of sound matter in a small space.

Mr. Vogan, known already by his Bampton Lectures, has published five sound and useful Sermons, apparently as a companion to them.

Mr. Poole's Testimony of St. Cyprian against Rome is a careful and perspicuous Essay, showing that Rome is not legitimately what she claims to be, "the Mother and Mistress of all Churches." He considers that, in St. Cyprian's judgment, St. Peter was a symbol and not the instrument of unity, that all bishops are such instruments, and are what St. Peter typified; that Rome, as being the sedes Petri, has a natural primacy of honour and of deference in faith and practice among the Churches, not a power of jurisdiction; that over those Churches, which trace their orders to Rome, she is in some sense the instrument of unity as being the witness of the truth, but loses her privilege when and so far as she declines from the truth. Mr. Poole will allow us to ask why he says "Peter" instead of "St. Peter;" the usage of Latin and Greek divinity is no authority; give us back the early ages and we can dispense with such ceremonial observances; but in times when irreverence is rife, we must make up for what we have lost as we may; and this is one of those means which remains to us of preserving a tone of mind which the world would fain take from us.

Mr. Cape, B.A., of Balliol College, Oxford, has added to an "Inquiry into the Use of Church Authority, &c." a catena of English Divines, "who have regarded Scripture as the *only test* of the divine will," and thereby incurred an *ignoratio elenchi* in the controversy in which he engages; the point in dispute being, whether, in *interpreting* that "only test" as regards matters of faith, an individual is to be guided by his own private judgment or by Catholic tradition. However, we highly approve of the principle of such undertakings; and though we think his to be defective, both as regards the point to be proved, and testimonies to prove it, we desire nothing better than to see others of the same kind. Let us know *how* and *where* English divines stand by all means. The persons he opposes have too much candour to aim at making the body of our divines more consistent than they really are, or at appropriating a Chillingworth and a Whitby, or even a Hall and a Cranmer. At the same time we feel assured, that at the end of the examination, those writers among our divines "whom all the people count as prophets," those whom they read and consult, know and revere, will not be found with Mr. Cape.

The Third Part of Mr. Girdlestone's Commentary on the Old Testament (from Joshua to Samuel), has been published; and to judge from the portions we have read, contains much sensible and useful application of the sacred narrative.

Mr. Lathbury's State of Popery and Jesuitism in England, forms a useful volume of reference for the series of historical events, connected with the subject, since the Reformation; but we fear we must say we agree in opinion with scarce a page of it.

We are glad to observe that Mr. Knox's Treatises on the Sacrament are published (Duncan) in one small volume. So original a thinker as Mr.

Knox, and with such deficient opportunities of instruction in the full "deposition" of faith, cannot of course be unreservedly recommended. But we believe this highly-gifted and religious man to be an instrument (if it is right so to speak) in the hands of Providence, of extensive good in the Church at this moment; and we are sure that, even granting he might mislead if followed *exclusively*, he will be found to impart most valuable information, and to suggest many deep, important, and practical views on a variety of subjects.

We invite attention to an Abridgment, just published, of Bishop Hall's "Episcopacy by Divine Right asserted" (Hatchard). The Bishop's name stands so high with a large portion of the religious public, and is so respected by all, that the republication of this Treatise promises to be very useful at this moment.

Another very important publication is that of Leslie's Case of the Regale and Pontificate (Leslie, Great Queen Street). All persons who have their minds to make up on the subject of Church and State, should study this celebrated work of one of the clearest and most powerful of our Divines.

It is encouraging to witness so many reprints of specimens of our standard theological and devotional works. A third reprint, which needs no notice of ours to recommend it, is Bishop Cosin's Devotions for the Hours of Prayer. It both indicates and, we trust, will further the growth of a devotional temper among us.

And another valuable reprint is a small Tract of the beginning of the last century, called Pietas Londinensis (Burns); from which it appears that at that time there were daily prayers in no fewer than seventy-one London churches and chapels.

In connection with this last subject may be mentioned a most cheering occurrence, the re-opening of Lincoln's-Inn Chapel for daily service; on occasion of which an excellent Sermon, since published, was preached by the Rev. R. W. Browne, Assistant Preacher and Classical Professor in King's College, which deserves attention, both from its contents and the reputation of its author.

Mr. Irons, a young clergyman of great promise, has published a second series of Parochial Lectures, which, besides their intrinsic excellence, exhibits an additional instance how mistaken the common idea is, that the recent spread of Church doctrines is connected with any one place or set of persons, instead of being, as it is, *the necessary effect of increased theological reading.* In the case of the clergy this effect *must* follow, if they are honest, *or* a necessity of retiring from their existing engagements. Mr. Irons observes, in his

Preface, that his religious views, which are in accordance with those of the first ages, were formed quite independently of those sources to which the present improved tone concerning Church doctrine is commonly ascribed.

Mr. Coxe, of St. James's, has published an impressive Charity Sermon, under the title of "The Lowly Station dignified." Nothing can convey more strikingly the low standard of religious knowledge and principle in the Metropolis, than to find from the author's preface that so unexceptionable a composition has been accused of being too political and *too* high Church.

We are in expectation of two interesting works by Mr. Wigram, "The Schoolmaster's Manual," which is a collection of Practical Hints for the information of National Schoolmasters; and "Occasional Papers," on the same subject. The intimate knowledge of his subject, which Mr. Wigram's situation as Secretary to the National Society gives him, will add great weight to his opinion.

Dr. Hook, of Leeds, has published a carefully considered Tract on the Athanasian Creed: in which he has shown the coincidence between it and Scripture on the doctrines which it expounds. A controversy has arisen in his neighbourhood about some of those points of doctrine which are now so generally under discussion. The Rev. Miles Jackson opened the controversy with an attack on Dr. Hook, on the ground that persons in Oxford had written Tracts which Mr. Jackson considered Popish; and which Dr. Hook approved, so far as he considered them not Popish but Anglican. In an unassuming and effective Pamphlet Mr. Ward, of Leeds, has shown that the several propositions, gathered from the Tracts by Mr. Jackson, in favour of baptismal regeneration, &c. &c., are all held by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, whom Mr. Jackson had spoken of as "a very Shakspeare in divinity," an authority "to which it would be fatal to stand conspicuously opposed." Mr. Poole has published a learned answer to the same charges, in which he clears up the misrepresentations and sophistry on which such statements are commonly based. From the same place has appeared an Appeal on the Doctrines of Sacramental Efficacy, Apostolical Succession, and Church and State, by a Dissenting Minister named Ely. Of him we know nothing; but we are bound to state that he writes in a subdued and thoughtful spirit (though, of course, with most erroneous views of the Gospel), and far surpasses any pamphlet on the same side which has proceeded from Churchmen.

We have to thank Mr. Pratt, of Cruden, for Three excellent Sermons on Scottish Episcopacy. It being very important to circulate information in England concerning our deeply injured sister Church, we are glad to be able to refer our readers to any publications, like the present, which are devoted to that object. Mr. Ramsay has published his Sermon preached at the consecration of the Bishop of Glasgow and the Bishop (assistant) of Brechin. It is one of those testimonies to the doctrine of the divine origin and privileges of the Church, which are now happily so common.

Several interesting publications have reached us from Burlington (New Jersey). Bishop Doane's eloquent Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Wolff; the Journal of the Fifty-fourth Annual Convention of the Church over which he presides; and Translations of the Epistles of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

The importance of the Christian Knowledge Society makes it necessary to attend to their proceedings in proportion as it is painful to do so; for this reason, we subjoin the following short account of what has taken place in the last several monthly meetings. A few months ago Mr. Clarke brought forward a motion, the purport of which was to expunge from the list all the tracts which had been suffered to go out of print within a certain period. The feeling of the meeting was strongly against this resolution; when Dr. Russell moved, as an amendment, "that all tracts which at any time shall have been out of print for *five* years shall be considered as no longer on the list." This was carried.

A more injurious regulation cannot well be conceived, since it obviously tends to destroy the *permanency* of the character of the tracts; *e. g.* if any subject should not excite attention for a few years, and the tracts relating to it go out of print, the lovers of old opinions will be placed under the disadvantage of having to get new tracts on the list, instead of having merely to revive the old ones already there. There would be no hope in this day of getting on the list a tract entitled "*The Christian Sacrifice;*" Nelson's, to wit.

At the April meeting, Dr. Spry brought forward a resolution to the effect that it shall not be lawful for any member to furnish to any newspaper a report of the discussions which took place at the Board. An amendment was moved by Mr. Tyler, extending the prohibition to all periodical publications. This was carried in a very large meeting, about two-thirds of the members present supporting it.

At the meeting in May, a Report from the Standing Committee was taken into consideration; the purport of which was to recommend "that the Tract Committee should be empowered, with the approbation of the Episcopal Referees, to place Books and Tracts on the Society's Catalogue." The object of this resolution was to get rid of the unseemliness of taking a ballot in the general meeting on the admission of tracts, which had already received the sanction of the five Bishops. The recommendation of the Standing Committee was adopted, 210 members voting in its favour, and 65 against it.

Notwithstanding the resolution passed in May, the "Record" newspaper continued to report the discussions; this being noticed at the meeting, Mr. Gordon, on June 5th, moved "that the resolution entered upon the minutes of the April meeting in regard to the non-publication of reports of any discussions which take place at the meeting of this board is altogether null and void."

Mr. Gordon's resolution was discussed and negatived, by a majority of about 2 to 1.

In the course of these meetings much miserable wrangling, much boisterousness and unseemly confusion occurred: such exhibitions are, unhappily, no novelty now in the Society; but what is a novelty, and demands serious notice, is the introduction of the principle of parliamentary divisions. It was once the aim of the Society to pass every thing without division at all, even by showing of hands. Then division was only called for when the decision was doubtful; but now it is called for the purpose of showing *the strength of parties*, an object altogether inconsistent with the character of such a meeting.

Printed by C. Roworth and Sons, Bell Yard, Temple Bar.